

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 15, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, almighty God, that as we strive to know the truth about ourselves and our world, we do not lose sight of the gifts of the spirit—that spirit that gives vigor and vitality and power to all we do. We know that we can so easily see the things of the world—the world of the physical and the world of what is called reality. Open our eyes, O God; to see not only what is before us and around us, but to see more clearly the reality of the spirit that gives rise to hope and love and to all the values of the heart. Give us, O God, Your spirit of love and understanding, that binds us to all people and allows us to serve with graciousness and integrity. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. VISCLOSKY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2034. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve veterans' health programs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 409. An act to extend the terms of various patents, and for other purposes.

S. 616. An act to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans.

S. 1130. An act to provide for continuing authorization of Federal employee leave transfer and leave bank programs, and for other purposes.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN IS STRONG ON DEFICIT REDUCTION

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is high noon again. The conference committee on the President's economic plan starts today.

Mr. Speaker, the President's plan is strong on deficit reduction. We will accomplish the largest deficit reduction in history and lock it into a deficit trust fund.

The rich will pay their share, requiring the 6-percent wealthiest in this country to pay at least three-fourths of all the new taxes in the plan.

The President's plan creates jobs, and we target incentives for businesses to create these jobs. Investment specifically is targeted to spur growth, and Social Security is protected. We will protect older Americans from draconian cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and VA benefits that the Republicans have proposed.

Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal had an analysis of the Republican plan. There is nothing there. There is no alternative to the President's economic plan, one that is equitable, that is fair, and will get us moving in the economy again.

THE BUSINESS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's laser beam on the economy is more of a death ray on small business and jobs. Perhaps nowhere else in the Clinton agenda is there a broader chasm between what this President says and what he does.

In his speech to Congress February 17, 1993, President Clinton said, and I quote:

Because small business has created such a high percentage of all the new jobs in our na-

tion over the last 10 to 15 years, our plan includes the boldest targeted incentives for small business in history.

And what are those incentives? A job burning Btu tax and while America's 50 largest corporations will pay 3 percent more taxes, small businesses get from Clinton up to a 60-percent tax hike, and 10 percent capital gains tax increase. And Clinton's class warfare soak-the-rich program: it does not soak the rich. It drowns small businesses. Bill Clinton's economic program has historic incentives for small business, all right. The Clinton incentives encourage small business to go out of business.

TIME TO SUPPORT AMERICA

(Mrs. MEEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to put people first, we must remind our Republican colleagues of what this budget debate is really about. It is about children. The Republicans want to cut funding for child immunization and Head Start. Family preservation provisions passed by the House will save lives and reduce child abuse.

This is a deficit cutting package. But it is also a responsible one. Behind the facade of the Republican cry over spending caps is the elimination of provisions aimed at helping children and poor families. Continued tax breaks for the rich is not the backbone of our society and economy. That was tried and failed. It is time to pass the President's \$500 billion deficit reduction plan which takes responsibility for the deficit that grew out of control during the Reagan-Bush years.

They will help keep children safe and improve foster care and adoption assistance for children at risk. If the Republicans have their way, they will deny increased food assistance to children whose families cannot buy enough food due to high housing costs.

The earned income tax credit will reward poor families that help themselves through hard work. I think it is time for Members of both parties to be responsible for the decisions we make today for future generations.

DON'T BET ON IT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, will Clintonomics create jobs, spur economic growth, and promote prosperity?

Let us ask those on the front lines of the economy, the small business owners.

Ralph Reiland, who owns a restaurant in Pittsburgh, has this to say about the Clinton style of Government:

Clinton's mass of proposed new taxes, mandates and regulations has spooked American business, especially the ones that create jobs. As the owner of a small restaurant I am looking at higher energy taxes, higher minimum wages, new family leave costs, insurance liability increases, higher alcohol taxes, new health-care taxes, and smaller entertainment deductions for my customers. . . . I must react to higher costs by cutting jobs. In fact, I already know which cooks and servers I have to fire, and I know they have done nothing wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this story could be repeated tenfold.

Will Clintonomics spur economic growth? Don't bet on it.

BOSNIA NEEDS HELP IMMEDIATELY

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the images from Sarajevo compel me to rise. We are sickened by the horrible carnage wrought by a Serbian mortar shell striking a crowd waiting to get water. Twelve people were killed.

After the attack, surgeons were forced to operate on the wounded without anesthesia, without monitors for vital signs, with only flashlights for illumination.

This senseless killing in which we have somewhere in the neighborhood of between 140,000 and 200,000 people either killed or missing within the last year is a sad metaphor for the fate of this city in this once great land.

Sarajevo has not had electricity, tap water, natural gas for 5 weeks. Dysentery is widespread, and diseases are spreading throughout the city.

Unfortunately we have not allowed the Bosnians to do much on their own behalf. We have to act immediately to fulfill the U.N. mandate to deliver humanitarian aid, and we must lift the arms embargo to allow the Bosnians to defend themselves. It is the least, Mr. Speaker, that we can do.

HIGHEST EARNERS PAY LARGEST SHARE OF TAXES

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Internal Revenue Service [IRS] just released its analysis of all tax returns filed in 1991.

Yesterday, I pointed out to our Members that raising the top tax rate in 1991 about 10—from 28 to 31 percent—

had the perverse yet entirely predictable affect of decreasing Federal revenues by 6 percent among wealthiest taxpayers.

Today, I would like to expose and explode another tax myth that the Clinton administration is promoting to sell its \$322 billion tax increase—the myth that the rich just don't carry their fair share of the tax burden.

According to the IRS' own data, the top one-half percent of all income earners pay nearly a quarter of all taxes. That's right. In 1991, the top 850,000 taxpayers paid \$100 billion in taxes out of a total of \$349 billion.

Now, you tell me, when one-half of 1 percent of the people are paying 22 percent of the taxes is that unfair?

Or, is it strictly a demagogic appeal to mean-spirited and un-American class warfare?

Mr. Speaker, we won't find the solution to our deficit problem by raising taxes. The solution is to decrease the size of Government. Cut spending first.

□ 1010

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN OFFERS REAL CHANGE AND A BRIGHT FUTURE

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton and the Democrats have a plan to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion. The Republican plan falls short of \$500 billion while using the same gimmicks that quadrupled our debt during the past 12 years.

The Democrats' plan makes 200 specific cuts in Federal spending. Even though the Republicans say "cut spending first" their latest plan didn't offer even one additional cut above what is included in President Clinton's plan.

The Democrats make the richest 6 percent of Americans pay 75 percent of all new taxes. The Republicans protect the rich at the expense of our children, and the middle class.

The Democrats' plan has created lower interest rates, making it easier to own a home. In fact, refinancing a \$100,000 mortgage from 10 to 7.5 percent will save working Americans \$175 a month, which more than offsets the \$17 a month in increased taxes.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the economic plan proposed by President Clinton and the Democrats is good for the country. It offers real change and it will work to secure the brightest future for our Nation.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] keep pulling rabbits out of the hat in trying to justify their continued opposition to NAFTA.

First, they say there is no way that the American worker can compete against low-paid Mexican workers, despite the fact that American workers are already competing and winning, as reflected in our trade surplus with Mexico.

Then, leftist environmental groups hold up Judge Richey's decision requiring the administration to submit an environmental impact study on NAFTA, despite the fact that NAFTA will allow us to help Mexico improve its environmental standards.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to quit the magic act and look at the fact that NAFTA will increase trade—period. And, anytime you increase trade, you create jobs and increase the standard of living—these are proven historical facts.

I urge my colleagues to approve NAFTA.

GENOCIDE GOES UNCHECKED IN BOSNIA

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, genocide continues in Bosnia. In 50 years, the United Nations has never proved so impotent. In fact the United Nations has encouraged genocide by denying Bosnia—one of its members—the fundamental right of self defense.

No atrocity, not 200,000 slaughtered for their religion, not deliberate starvation of besieged refugees, not wholesale destruction of religious shrines, not bombardment of children in schoolyards or people lined up to get water or mourners burying their dead; not even the death of wounded and premature babies in hospitals denied medicine and fuel and electricity to operate is enough to shame the European Community to action.

The only unabashedly Communist dictator left in Europe who boasts of the final solution, using Hitler's very words, will be given exactly what he wants.

And the United States, the world's beacon of religious freedom and ethnic diversity, and the most powerful nation in history, does nothing. What a disgraceful performance.

AMERICANS ARE SAYING CUT SPENDING FIRST

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, during the break I had the experience of traveling to 16 cities in my district and I talked and spoke to people. Most importantly, I listened.

It is still out there, they are still saying it: "Cut spending first."

They know that since 1982 we have had five tax increases designed to reduce the deficit. Congress was quick to increase taxes, but when it came time to do the cutting, Congress had forgotten all about it. Not one of the five had reduced the deficit or done anything to reduce our national debt.

The people also know that they are paying about 40 to 50 percent of their income in taxes. You add it up—and I challenge folks who are listening to do this—you add up your property tax, your sales tax, your utility tax, your insurance premium taxes, ad valorem taxes, your license fees, your income tax on city, State, and Federal levels, and you are already paying more than you need to be paying. You are patriotic enough, you do not need to invest.

Two weeks ago, I had the opportunity to speak to some Soviet Georgians, and I asked them, "What is your highest tax bracket?" And they said, "22 percent." That is from a former Communist country.

Mr. Speaker, folks in my district and all over America are saying it right: "Cut spending first."

APPROVAL OF CLINTON PLAN—A STEP TOWARD BALANCING FEDERAL BUDGET

(Mr. BARLOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, as we move toward conference, I want to ask the American people to join together and send a message to the naysayers in Congress to quit bickering, tell the truth and pass the President's budget. Of course, there are things in this proposed budget that must not stand final passage, especially the barge tax and Btu tax that will unduly harm the barge industry and farmers. However, with a few changes, the President's budget will serve as a very important first step for America toward the eventual balancing of the Federal budget.

To those in the minority, I say: Quit distorting the facts. Rise above partisan politics and pull together for the benefit of our Nation that I know you respect and love. The truth is that the budget plan that we passed does cut the overall spending trend. It does provide \$500 billion in deficit reduction over the next 5 years rather than only \$335 billion as the minority has proposed. It does make those citizens who have benefited the most pay their fair share while keeping taxes low on working men and women. We must show the American people that we can success-

fully rise to meet our national challenges. America's economic future hangs in the balance.

DEMOCRATS, SAVE YOUR PRESIDENT: VOTE AGAINST HIS PLAN

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's administration is again showing why they cannot be trusted with words or numbers.

First, they redefine income to allege that only the rich will pay the tax increase, the largest in American history.

Mr. Speaker, now, to answer the criticism that his plan will clobber small business, the Clinton Treasury Department has defined away small business. As the Wall Street Journal reports, the Treasury Department "refuses to count anybody who gets more than half his income as wage or salary, which effectively whittles the business-owning population down from 21 million to 7 million."

It does not matter how President Clinton messes up the English language, the reality is that nearly 1 million small business owners are going to face a whopping tax increase under the Clinton plan. It is small business, my Democrat friends, that creates three out of four new jobs in the economy.

You cannot raise taxes \$300 billion and only effect the rich.

I implore my Democrat friends, save your President, vote against his plan. After all, you owe it to yourselves.

UNITED STATES LACKING IN RESOLVE ON TRAGEDY IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

(Mr. HASTINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage over the situation in the former Yugoslavia. I am not, this morning, advocating that we take one position or another, or even that we endorse one side over another. I am saying that we cannot be seduced into forgetting about the conflict because it is easier to push it out of our minds than it is to remember that these people are suffering tremendously and we have done little to help them.

Sarajevo has not had water, natural gas, or electricity in weeks. Schools have been closed, food supplies are virtually nonexistent. People on all sides of the conflict are being slaughtered mercilessly while their leaders are stalling the peace talks and strutting about with pathetic machismo.

I understand the President's position on avoiding unilateral actions and

agree that the European Community must also take responsibility for bringing about a resolution to this conflict. But even if we cannot solve the situation singlehandedly, we cannot stop thinking about the children who go to sleep at night worrying if there will still be a roof over their heads when they awake. The children of the former Yugoslavia are not going to camp this summer—they are dodging mortar. They are not complaining about having to get up to go to school in the mornings—they are already out looking for food.

We cannot ignore the fact that lives are being ruined and families are being destroyed. Do I have an answer? No. Do I have a better idea than that already put forth by this administration? No. What do I plan to do about it? I plan to remember every single day that while my own children are safe and my mother is well taken care of, that people only a short plane ride away are being massacred because of intangible hatreds and long-remembered slights. I will think about them, pray for their safety and hope that someday they will forgive us for our lack of resolve.

□ 1020

HEALTH CARE FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am in shock.

President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress want to provide \$300 million so illegal aliens can have health care at taxpayer expense.

At a time when not all Americans have health insurance, when our Federal debt and deficit are at record highs, and when this administration is about to pass the largest tax increase in the history of the world, how can the President even consider spending one dime for health care for illegal aliens?

I can tell you that my constituents in Contra Costa and Alameda Counties in California do not want to pay the medical bills for people who sneak into this country. First, they want American citizens to have access to quality, affordable health care.

I am still outraged to know that illegal aliens already receive some Federal medical assistance free of charge. But to add insult to injury, the President wants to make the Federal Government foot the whole bill.

This makes no sense at all. The President and the Democrats in this body are sending a message to the world: "If you have a problem, come to the United States, we'll take care of you."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and our President to rethink this horrendous idea.

FLOOD LOSSES BY FARMERS

(Mr. MINGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to correct disinformation that appeared last night on the CBS News regarding flooding losses suffered by farmers. The thrust of the report was that these farmers do not deserve assistance from their Government because they chose not to have flood insurance. Such logic would suggest that people who choose to live in California should not be entitled to earthquake relief and people who choose to live in Florida or Hawaii should not be entitled to hurricane relief.

More importantly, for thousands of farmers who did purchase insurance, the insurance program itself is a disaster.

These farmers cannot collect a thin dime because they were not able to plant the seed. They have seen their coverage disappear because the Draconian provisions of the program further penalize them because they could not plant on time due to the flooding.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my home State of Minnesota have not seen a disaster of this dimension for 100 years. If the Government is not here to help them in this time of crisis, then I ask, what does the Government exist for?

DEMOCRATIC SPENDING

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the tax-and-spend Democrats are at it again. They have come to the floor today claiming that what they want to do is tax the rich, but the American people have already figured out that the rich in their definition are \$20,000 a year families and small business operators.

And what are all those new taxes going to go for? Well, they have told us today what they are going to go for. They are going to go for bigger Government. The country is better, they believe, when the Government is bigger.

Just look at the national service bill they have on the floor right now that adds 25,000 new Federal employees in the name of bigger Government.

They also want more welfare. Listen to the people who have talked here today. No matter how they couch the terms, the reality is that they want more social welfare spending. They want welfare, rather than work. They want spending, rather than saving. They want bigger Government, rather than better Government.

The American people have figured this all out. That is why the Democrats have become so worried. Their welfare state is not wanted by the people who have to pay the bill.

Not one Republican is expected to vote for the tax-and-spend package.

Every dime of new taxes will be Democrat taxes. Every dime of new debt will be Democrat debt. Every dime of new spending will be Democrat spending. Every dime of new deficit will be Democrat deficit.

OUR RIDICULOUS CHINA POLICY

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the free traders in Congress have given China most-favored-nation trade status. They say that China is moving toward new free market reform.

Check out this new reform. China has a new consumer protection law. Here is how it works. If you do shoddy work, you can get a life sentence in jail. If you knowingly produce a faulty product, Mr. Speaker, you get the death penalty.

I guess those two prison laborers over there are saying, "What happened to number 126?"

They are saying, "Well, he made a faulty toaster."

Mr. Speaker, this is not reform. This is ridiculous. China is now our No. 2 trade deficit partner, and it is time we straightened it out.

This is not reform. This is stretching quality control a little too far. The free traders better take a look at it.

NAFTA, THE JOB KILLER

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, why is our Trade Representative in such a hurry to force the flawed North American Free-Trade Agreement on the American people? The North American Free-Trade Agreement is a job killer.

What happens to small business under NAFTA? Recently over July 4, I visited a cement plant in Medina, OH, in my district. Workers and management are scared to death of the North American Free-Trade Agreement. How do they compete with a large American firm that moves to Mexico and hires workers at 58 cents an hour and avoids environmental laws and evades job safety and child labor laws? How do they compete?

If a plant leaves Ohio or leaves the United States and moves south, NAFTA, the job killer, kills communities. It hurts the schools. It hurts other businesses. It hurts insurance agents and florists and all kinds of retail outlets that serve those workers that are now unemployed.

Mr. President, slow down and get it right. Get it right for American business, get it right for American jobs, get it right for American workers.

Mr. Speaker, the more the American people know about NAFTA, the less they like it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLVER). The gentleman should address his remarks to the Chair and not to the President.

HEALTH CARE FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the House version of the tax bill, or so-called deficit reduction bill, includes \$300 million in Medicaid funds for additional health benefits to illegal aliens. In the 6 months I have served in this body, I have seen some bad legislation. But the proposal to spend \$300 million more of taxpayers hard-earned dollars to pay the health care costs of illegal aliens takes the cake.

I hope those Members who are opposed to spending Federal dollars on illegal aliens will use their influence to encourage the House conferees to strip this \$300 million boondoggle from the budget proposal. The time has come for this body to take responsibility for how it spends the hard-earned dollars of American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know for sure how many illegal aliens are residing in this country today, but the number is estimated to be at least 5 million. This number is increasing daily, and according to one study the cost of supporting these illegal aliens is at least \$7 billion annually.

During the July recess, I had meetings with over 150 business and civic leaders from my district. Their message was to cut benefits for illegal aliens and defeat the Clinton tax plan.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 2264, OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OLVER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees on H.R. 2264, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993:

As additional conferees from the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of title I and section 9005 (a)-(c) and (f) of the House bill, and title I and section 5001, 5002 (a), (b) and (d), and 5003 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DE LA GARZA, ROSE, GLICKMAN, VOLKMER, PENNY, ROBERTS, EMERSON, and GUNDERSON.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of sections 1405(c) of the House bill, and that portion of section 1201 which adds a new section 305(c)(4) to the Rural Electrification

Act, of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONYERS, ENGLISH of Oklahoma, PETERSON of Minnesota, BARRETT of Wisconsin, WASHINGTON, CLINGER, MCCANDLESS, and HASTERT.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of those portions of section 4002 which add new sections 453(a)(3) and 456(a)(2) to the Higher Education Act, 4029 and 13560 of the House bill, and those portions of section 12011 which add new section 453(a)(4) and 456(a)(2) to the Higher Education Act, of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. TOWNS, WAXMAN, SPRATT, CLINGER, MCCANDLESS, and HASTERT.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of section 9008 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. SPRATT, SYNAR, WASHINGTON, CLINGER, MCCANDLESS, and HASTERT.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of title XVI and sections 15001-111, 15206, and 15301 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONYERS, SPRATT, and WAXMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. SYNAR, CLINGER, MCCANDLESS, and HASTERT.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration of title VII of the House bill, and title XI and section 12047(a) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, HUGHES, EDWARDS of California, CONYERS, SYNAR, MOORHEAD, COBLE, and FISH.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 4025(7) and that portion of section 5203 which adds a new section 309(j)(8) to the Communications Act of 1934, of the House bill, and that portion of section 12011 which adds a new section 455(j) to the Higher Education Act, 12045(7), of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, CONYERS, and SYNAR, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Messrs. BERMAN, FISH, GALLEGLY, and MOORHEAD.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 12105 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, BRYANT, GLICKMAN, FRANK of Massachusetts, BERMAN, GEKAS, RAMSTAD, and FISH.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair advises the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that these are the Speaker's additional appointments to the con-

ference committee under rule X. Unanimous consent is not required under the rule, and consequently reservations of objection are not in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Just before the Speaker took the chair, the action before the House then was without objection that these appointments would be made. I understand rule X, but are we going to now revise the procedure on the floor, and is the Speaker announcing such?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be considered as an en bloc amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that that request is not necessary. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, be confined to 20 minutes on each side, with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] controlling half of the time and myself controlling half of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that is satisfactory. As I understand it, the request is just for my amendment; it does not apply to subsequent amendments?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me say that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is only for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and all amendments thereto.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which would reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts by 5 percent. This cut would result in a \$8.7 million reduction from the \$174.5 million amount requested by the committee and leave \$165.9 million to the NEA.

For the last several years, I have offered amendments to the Interior ap-

propriations bill to reduce funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. I continue to feel strongly that the U.S. Government must take a stern approach in reducing our national deficit. In these times of budgetary crisis, it is necessary to reduce funding for a program that is not vital to the economic health of this Nation.

We must concentrate our resources on what is absolutely necessary, not just desirable. I seriously question Federal funding of the NEA when private funding for the arts was \$9.32 billion in 1992. When the vast majority of arts funding comes from private sources, why is NEA funding considered absolutely necessary when our deficit continues to climb toward \$400 billion?

When Congress is asking our constituents back home to accept more taxes, how can we justify spending \$174.5 million on this program. Oftentimes when I am on the floor of the House, I hear Members comment that an \$8 or \$10 million reduction is not significant, but let me assure you \$8 million is significant back home. The \$8.7 million that we save here can be spent on a school lunch program or a Head Start Program.

Throughout the past few weeks, we have cut spending in many programs, both large and small. These proposals have spanned from the elimination of the superconducting super collider and a reduction in the space station to reductions in construction costs of Federal buildings. We will continue to see similar proposals in the appropriations bills that have not yet reached the floor of the House. In light of this, it seems appropriate that we should reduce the funding of such a controversial program as the NEA.

This current funding proposal for the NEA is \$39 million more than the funding for breast and cervical cancer prevention passed earlier this year. We must ask ourselves what is more important—promotion of the arts or the health of the women of this Nation?

Several years ago, the NEA was involved in tremendous controversy over funding programs that were considered unfit for public viewing. More recently though, the NEA has litigated with artists who claim discrimination against their artwork. When these subsidies result in so much controversy, we should review the existence and the importance of funding this organization. These court battles have absorbed even more of our taxpayers' money. It makes sense to reduce the funding level so the NEA can fund only the most important cultural projects and avoid projects which could result in controversy.

My colleagues, we simply must prioritize our spending, and a 5-percent cut in the NEA is a good place to start. We must continue to be diligent in our spending reductions. Although this \$8.7 million reduction is a small start, it is

a start nonetheless. We must begin somewhere.

Last, many Members have asked me to cut more. I understand their concern, but I think this is a good start. And for those Members who did not want to eliminate the NEA but wanted a vote on this matter showing that they wanted to reduce NEA funding, I believe this amendment is a fair way to do that.

□ 1040

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], predicated his argument upon the same arguments that were presented yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], and I think that in the course of that debate it was shown that the figures used by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] to indicate that there was no need for public funding of the arts anymore because private funding had increased to the point where it could adequately supply funds for all the arts organizations in the country, were in error. Nothing is further from the truth, Mr. Chairman.

Just as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] used distorted figures, my friend, the gentleman from Florida, uses the same figures when he quotes the sum of \$9 billion being available annually for the arts from private sources. I read, in response to the argument by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], that that was an inappropriate figure. The facts from the document that had been used to establish that figure are that the figure was established not on the basis only for the arts. It was established based upon a category that included, as well, funds for the humanities and funds for so-called culture. When we consider the amount of funds that went into the other two subcategories, it leaves a relatively low sum available for the arts.

For example, the figure is based upon grants to organizations such as communications organizations like film, video, and holography, television, print, publishing, newspapers, literary journals, publishers, producers of print material, radio, also to history museums, to marine and maritime museums, to natural history and natural science museums, anthropological and Native American museums, science and technological museums, sports, hobby museums, specialized museums, art history, history and archeology, classical languages, foreign language schools—I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman. This is just about half of the organizations which received grants that are included in that figure and which have no relationship to the arts.

So that figure is totally irrelevant in making an argument that arts organi-

zations receive this vast amount of private funds.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], talked about the sensational art that NEA was financing. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that it is an aberration of the usual grant when NEA has art that is sensational. You could count them on the fingers of both hands, compared to the amount of grants by NEA that are the kind of grants that the people of America want and cherish and which make up their approval of the arts endowment.

So I say to my friend, the gentleman from Florida, that his cut will hurt NEA. A cut of \$8.7 million will have enormous impact upon the arts funding in this country. It will mean the difference between life and death for numbers of arts organizations which depend upon NEA and upon the private giving that NEA stimulates, the private giving that each grant requires in order that the grant be approved, a match of one to one, from private giving, or more than that, up to as much as 1 to 5 or 1 to 10 in many circumstances. If this seed money is cut out by this kind of amendment, an amendment that deprives the arts of over \$8 million, Mr. Chairman, the arts indeed will be terribly, terribly hurt.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's amendment is disapproved.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have just a few comments. I want my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], to know how much respect I have for him. I think he does an able job presenting the other side.

The argument I am trying to make here is one of fiscal restraint, and I would say this to the gentleman: He and I have talked about this over a period of 2 or 3 months now, and my argument this morning is that if all programs in Congress are talking a reduction of 1 or 2 percent, certainly the NEA could take a reduction of 5 percent.

□ 1050

I want to say to the gentleman I understand the budget this year has only gone up about \$100,000 over last year, and I think that is a good step. I want to compliment the gentleman for that. But I would say to the gentleman, a 5-percent cut in anything is probably a prudent position, and I think the seed money the gentleman is talking about could be garnered through more efficient operation, or in many ways prioritized the different projects you were going to award for.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by reiterating my respect for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

YATES]. The gentleman certainly is a worthy proponent of the arts on the House floor. Yesterday, with great sorrow I voted for total abolition of NEA funds. Why? Because of the arrogance of a handful of people who continue to offend the sensibilities of hardworking American taxpayers by funding disgusting and sophomoric pseudo-art. Yes, these offensive works can be counted on the fingers of two hands, out of thousands of grants, but these instances of arrogance, blasphemy, and desecration of American virtues make up in offense what they lack in numbers. The assault on virtues held dear to the overwhelming majority of American people are so egregious and so arrogant that we must have at least this 5-percent cut. We must get a message across to the bureaucrats who administer the National Endowment for the Arts that we are not going to tolerate this filth. How else are we ever going to get control of these precious dollars for the arts?

Now, I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], that I was driving around Los Angeles last weekend. While driving through the Sepulveda Pass from the west Los Angeles area to the San Fernando Valley, I saw giant cranes building one of the Nation's largest art museums. This was sponsored by one person, long gone to his eternal reward, J. Paul Getty.

The Getty Foundation is building a museum in the hills of the Santa Monica Park area that will cost more than the entire NEA appropriation.

If we should take the \$9.2 billion figure of private money spent on general cultural projects and whittle it down because I did not hear a bottom line figure from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. If it is \$9 billion and you take out all the maritime museums and everything else that the gentleman enumerated, what is it, \$7, \$6, \$5, \$4, \$2 billion that the private sector spent on art?

The last Van Gogh painting on the market sold for more than 30 percent of the entire NEA budget. This painting was created by an artist who never sold a painting in his life.

I mentioned a column yesterday by a great commentator, Mona Charen, and I just want to read two paragraphs. Before that, however, I went to talk again about this Whitney Museum in New York, because yesterday we nitpicked to death whether or not the \$200,000 given in the last 2 years to the Whitney Museum of New York City has spent on one of these offensive, ugly, blasphemous displays. The question is whether or not if we give \$200,000 of taxpayer funds to turn on the lights, to heat or cool the place, to pay for the security guards, the cleaning people. We are paying for this particular abject art exhibit. Are we not being more than disingenuous, and maybe a little

phony, to say that no public money is going to the ugly exhibit that is at the Whitney Museum at this moment? Does the money just melt into thin air?

Listen to what Mona Charen says about our country. She says,

This moral swamp we have allowed to emerge threatens the United States far more than huge budget deficits, a failing educational system or the challenges of global competition.

She said in a paragraph earlier,

Liberals, evangelists of the sexual revolution, never believed that by devaluing chastity they would be devaluing women. An information survey of 50 youngsters from a variety of neighborhoods in the New York area conducted by the New York Times reveals the coarse and vulgar world in which teenagers now react. This is a world in which romance is gone—replaced by easy sex and trashy language. Ask the girls, who are almost universally addressed as bitch in New York City, whether free sex has resulted in greater respect.

Would we like to take some of these kids to the Whitney Museum right there at 945 Madison Avenue on the corner of 75th Street? I went to the first and second grades in New York City, not six blocks from this museum. Imagine that we take them to this publicly funded institution on a field trip, and what do they see? This abject art exhibit, with a young woman relieving herself in a toilet; a three-foot mound of excrement; a dismembered sculpture of two women engaging in sodomy; framed samples of baby fecal stains; a film by two homosexual men called *Skull*, and then the street word for intercourse, where one man is shown—and again I cannot read this—inserting his head into another human being's body and then engaging in more perversion, a film titled *"Spy"* with Jesus Christ our Savior depicted as a woman standing naked with all of the genitalia exposed.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat what I said yesterday: there should be a ground rule that the tax dollars from hard-working men and women across this country should never go to anything that we cannot discuss in detail on the floor of this House.

You bet I come to the floor in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

I came to the floor a few weeks ago and read a phrase from George Washington's first inaugural address. I saw the original document in the Archives in his own handwriting. The Father of our Country said there is an "indissoluble link between virtue and happiness." That is 1789.

Many people do not like to speak about virtue here on the House floor. They are afraid that speaking of virtue might seem to suggest that we elected officials are forcing our morality on those that we represent. That is the view of those who believe that we live in a tyrannical political system with

Members of Congress dictating to the entire country their own personal whims.

Well, nothing is further from the truth. Just the opposite is the fact with the National Endowment for the Arts. When the NEA can fund indirectly—hear that word, colleagues—indirectly, \$200,000 to the Whitney Museum to set up this abject art exhibit and one on rape, the American people are disgusted. These exhibits are a disgrace when our country leads the world in rape, with every 15 seconds someone being raped in this country alone. Then we call this garbage, this degrading of women and our whole society, art. Please vote for this 5-percent cut.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the convoluted reasoning of some of my colleagues. They contend that even though the Whitney receives indirect funding through the NEA no funds went toward this particular exhibit. If Federal funds given to an institution are not in any way used for major exhibits within that institution, then what are the funds used for? If the Whitney can put on exhibits without the NEA then why do we fund them? It has been conceded that the Whitney does not need the NEA to put on its exhibits. That is the argument we have been making over the last couple of days. Let the Whitney continue their work without taxpayer funds. I commend the following article to my colleagues' attention.

[From the Washington Times, July 6, 1993]

ART TURNS HEADS, STOMACHS

(By Joyce Price)

As Congress considers bills to reauthorize the National Endowment for the Arts, an NEA-funded museum in New York is displaying an art exhibit featuring images of excrement and homoerotic acts.

A catalog for the "Abject Art: Repulsion and Desire" exhibit at the Whitney Museum of American Art says the show is intended to "confront taboo issues of gender and sexuality" using subject matter offensive to conservatives.

The catalog's introduction explains that "abject art" is a "body of work which incorporates or suggests abject materials such as dirt, hair, excrement, dead animals menstrual blood and rotting food."

Martin Mawyer, president of the Christian Action Network (CAN), viewed the show last week.

"The goal of the exhibit was to repulse, and I was repulsed," Mr. Mawyer said. "I guess that makes me an art connoisseur."

The NEA, which has endured several battles over its funding of controversial artists and artworks, has given \$302,000 to the Whitney Museum since 1990.

Since 1991, the federal arts endowment has provided \$65,000 to the Whitney's Independent Study Program, which mounted both "Abject Art" and a second exhibit, "The Subject of Rape." The two exhibits currently are the only ones on display at the museum.

Whitney spokesman Steven Schlough said the "Abject Art" exhibit has not received funds from the NEA or any other government source.

"Of the Independent Study Program's \$350,000 annual budget, the \$20,000 received last year from the NEA was allocated entirely for operating costs of the museum's studies programs," Mr. Schlough said.

CAN officials this week hand-delivered letters to the 114 freshman members of Congress and Republican congressional leaders urging them to abolish the NEA. The letter cites "Abject Art" as a prime reason to end NEA funding.

Mr. Mawyer blamed the depictions in the exhibit on the Clinton administration.

Although the Whitney's Independent Study Program was last awarded an NEA grant in 1992, during the Bush administration, Mr. Mawyer charged that "the fact that no one is at the helm of the NEA is exactly why these types of grants get abused at museums."

In the absence of a permanent chairman, the NEA is being run by Anna Steele, a senior deputy director.

"I feel that if Anne-Imelda Radice were still at the helm of the NEA, she would have denounced the exhibit and demanded the money back," Mr. Mawyer said.

Miss Radice took over as NEA chairman after President Bush fired John Frohnmayer. She won the support of many conservatives by insisting that are supported by the endowment should reflect the values of the majority of Americans.

NEA spokeswoman Ginny Terzano said the CAN president's comments "indicate how Mr. Mawyer's organization and other special interest groups spread misinformation about this agency."

"The [Whitney] grant was awarded by the previous administration. For him to blame it on the lack of a Clinton-appointed head of the endowment makes absolutely no sense," Ms. Terzano said.

As for "Abject Art," the museum catalog says the exhibit was "deemed urgent" because of recent American politics.

The introduction decries the "art censorship" of the late 1980s and early 1990s, the "verbal attacks on artists such as Robert Mapplethorpe, Andres Serrano, . . . Annie Sprinkle and Karen Finley" and the "rhetoric" of "Jesse Helms, Patrick Buchanan, and David Duke, not to mention Presidents Reagan and Bush."

"Employing methodologies adapted from feminism, queer theory, post-structuralism, Marxism and psychoanalysis, our goal is to talk dirty in the institution and degrade its atmosphere of purity and prudery," wrote Jack Ben-Levi, Craig Houser, Leslie C. Jones and Simon Taylor, all participants in the Whitney's Independent Study Program during 1992-93.

"Abject Art" includes depictions of:
A 3-foot mound of "synthetic" excrement.
A dismembered sculpture of two women engaging in oral sex.

A film showing one man pushing his head into another man's rectum.

A film titled "A Spy," which depicts Jesus Christ as a woman standing naked with her breasts exposed.

A film by porn star Annie Sprinkle titled "The Sluts and Goddesses Video Workshop or How to be a Sex Goddess in 101 Easy Steps."

Andres Serrano's "Piss Christ," a photo of a crucifix standing in a jar of urine, and the late Robert Mapplethorpe's "Self-Portrait," a photo showing him with a bullwhip in his rectum.

In the CAN letter, Mr. Mawyer tells freshman House members they "have been elected to Congress to reform a government fraught with waste and fraud. The NEA is a classic example . . . There exists no principled reason for allowing the federal government to fund art—especially when that art may not reflect the values and culture of the taxpayers footing the bill."

He also points out that the Serrano and Mapplethorpe works included in the show ignited the political controversy that has surrounded the NEA since the late 1980s. The Serrano and Mapplethorpe works are the "same two pieces of art which the House chose to defend in 1989," he says in the letter.

The House cut \$45,000—the total amount the NEA had provided in grants for two exhibits that included the Serrano and Mapplethorpe photographs—from the endowment's budget in fiscal 1990.

One freshman House member, Peter T. King, New York Republican, said Thursday he "opposes the NEA" and will vote to strike the \$174.59 million in funding being sought for the agency in fiscal 1994. That amount is \$130,000 over current funding levels.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today in support of Mr. STEARN's amendment. There are many good arguments for cutting the NEA, but the most compelling I believe is that the NEA no longer serves the taxpayers of our country. American art used to represent the virtues of our country. Pre-postmodern artists were trying to push the American pioneering spirit of adventure into the realm of art and intellect. Instead of those explorations, today we find callow pandering to the worst in the human spirit. This infantile shock art passes for intellectual and spiritual sustenance. I have already detailed some of the worst abuses of the NEA but I would like to keep focused on the larger issue. Because in this NEA-funded art, we find an assassination of virtue.

I came to the floor a few weeks ago to read a phrase from George Washington's first inaugural address. In that address our first President said that there is an "indissoluble link between virtue and happiness."

Many people don't like to speak about virtue here on the floor of the House. They are afraid that speaking of virtue might seem to suggest that we elected officials are forcing our morality on those that we represent. That is the view of those who believe that we live in a tyrannical political system with Members of Congress dictating to the entire country our own personal whims. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are here because we represent people, citizens, who have consented for these 2 years to give us legislative power over this body and the laws of this Nation. They have empowered us to come here and try to write laws that conform to the virtues of our community. These laws are the moral instruments of our day. Their essence is profoundly moral. We are here to say how our affairs will be conducted, how our public money will be spent and how America should move forward. If our Federal Government is not constantly fighting for excellence and virtue on every front, the Nation's stable happiness will be degraded.

For these reasons, I believe an NEA that does not fit with the virtue of our communities should cease to exist.

Yes, art can make us question our society, our norms, and our roles. That is why last year \$9.32 billion was spent in the private sector on art, an incredible increase of \$1.42 billion over the previous year. Allow the critique of capitalism, the critique of virtue, the critique of America to take place on someone else's dime. My constituents are striving for a more virtuous world, and one in which they can bet-

ter attain happiness. The NEA is no longer a part of that world. Therefore, I urge everyone to support the Stearn amendment.

REFLECTED IN THE WHIRLPOOL RITUAL
(By Mona Charen)

Venture with me once more into the world liberalism has created; New York City. New York has been governed politically, educationally, spiritually and morally by liberal ideas for at least 30 years. Fads that merely sideswiped other parts of the nation—like high-school condom distribution and a therapeutic approach to crime—have become institutional pillars of New York's liberal superstructure.

So how are they doing? One of the things liberals told us they could manage so much better than anyone else was the treatment of women.

News item: At least five teen-age boys have been arrested during the past week in New York for engaging in gang molestation of girls in public swimming pools. In a ritual called "the whirlpool," reports the New York Times, as many as 20 to 30 boys ranging in age from 12 to 17 link arms and surround a lone girl. They chant a slogan popular at basketball games—"Oops, there it is"—and then attack her, dunking her head under water, frequently tearing off her bathing suit top and sometimes grabbing at her breasts and genitals. This is high humor for the boys, perhaps especially if the girl is reduced to sobs of fear and humiliation.

All right, you say. Teen-agers misbehave. How can you possibly blame liberalism?

Consider the response of Betty Gotbaum, New York City commissioner of parks and appointee (presumably) of Liberal Mayor David Dinkins. She is the authority here. She is the representative of society's mores. Here's what she said: "This has been going on since time immemorial. And it's not right. But . . . we just have had a really bad five days."

No, New York has had a bad 30 years. "It's not right" is about the most tepid censure in the lexicon. How about "It's outrageous and will not be tolerated." Moreover, Miss Gotbaum betrays her limitations by suggesting that this behavior has been going on since "time immemorial." It has not. This kind of contempt for and cruelty to women wasn't a part of the America I grew up in. It wasn't a part of my mother's America either. Women were never treated this way in the worst days of the Great Depression or in the most libertine era of the Wild West.

No, it required the concentrated assault on "bourgeois values" that began in the '60s to so thoroughly unravel the fabric of civility that had previously survived war, depression and natural disasters.

An informal survey of 50 youngsters from a variety of neighborhoods in the New York area conducted by the New York Times reveals the coarse and vulgar world in which teen-agers now interact. This is a world in which romance is gone—replaced by easy sex and trash language. Liberals, evangelists of the sexual revolution, never believed that by devaluing chastity they'd be devaluing women. But ask the girls who are almost universally addressed as "bitch" in New York City whether free sex has resulted in greater respect.

The term "bitch" is no accident. It literally refers to a female dog. And the girls reciprocate by addressing boys as "dogs." Derrick James, 18, of Bogota, N.J., was asked by the Times how he accounted for the predatory, pack behavior of teenage boys.

"It's nature," he explained. "Look at a female dog and a male dog: It's the same thing.

You see 20 male dogs on a female dog. It's the male nature in a way."

So much for 5,000 years of civilization insisting that human beings, creatures created in the image and likeness of God, are not mere dogs in heat and are capable of better behavior.

This moral swamp we have allowed to emerge threatens the United States far more than huge budget deficits, a failing educational system or the challenges of global competition.

In my lifetime we have gone from a world in which men customarily rose from their chairs when a woman entered the room to a world in which a 14-year-old cannot swim in a public pool without fear of sexual assault. It's been a steep decline.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to respond to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. Apparently the gentleman did not hear my reply yesterday that I received from the Arts Endowment. The Arts Endowment specifically says it did not supply the money for the art exhibit to which the gentleman makes reference. That was a student project. It was funded by private funds given to the Whitney Museum. It was not funded by NEA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I was going to talk a little bit about arithmetic, for the NEA but I would like to start off talking about the Whitney Museum.

Mr. Chairman, I think that these are false accusations. The Whitney Museum is one of the great museums in this country. Every 2 years it has a project which exposes the American public to all the avant garde art. There it is, out there, for everyone to see. Some is great, some is horrible; some is good, some enduring. Then they cut the program. This is all, repeat all, privately funded. The accusations against the Whitney, in brief, are a red herring.

In any event, I rise here today in opposition to the Stearns amendment. I have great respect for the gentleman from Florida, I understand where he is coming from. I understand the desire to cut expenses and to be a responsible public servant.

But frankly, I think this is a ridiculous approach. If you do not like Federal support of the arts, say so. But do not nibble. Nibbling does not produce cost cuts. If one does not like the size of the Federal expense budget, cut it. Do not wave at it. Do not toy with it. That is not how you really get a big, important savings.

But I have a feeling, and I, of course, may be wrong, that the real thrust in this amendment is not to cut costs at all. It is to eliminate Federal arts funding altogether. The words are not there, but the arithmetic is.

Two years ago there was a suggestion to cut \$7 million; 1 year ago there was a suggestion to cut \$3 million. This

year it is \$8.7 million. At a compounded rate, you eliminate the whole arts budget in 6 years.

Private funds help big cities. They do not help rural communities. I live in a small community. Over the years we have contributed privately, both corporately and individually, more funding for the arts than I suppose almost any community our size in the country. It still was not enough. NEA came to the rescue, along with State funds.

□ 1100

The private funds will not do it alone, and cultural training is not an exotic area out there by itself. It is education, just as reading and writing means education.

Do we cut Spanish from schools because we are mad at El Salvador? Do we cut science because of the Challenger tragedy?

If we are going to cut because we have budget difficulties, then cut—do it—and tell people why. Do not camouflage the objective.

Once again, I plead that we not appear brave, which we are in fact timid—and in the process, snip at the edges. This gives us the worst of both worlds. We keep a program we really do not want while we delay the death notice.

Frankly, that is not what we are about here.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this very fair and reasonable and moderate amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS]. I commend him for offering this amendment, and I thank him for yielding time to me.

When a family is broke and not only broke but deeply in debt, they spend their limited resources on the basics like food, clothing, shelter and medical care. They do not spend their limited funds on expensive artwork.

Our Nation is in that same situation today. As almost everyone knows, we have a national debt of over \$4 trillion, \$4.2 trillion. As staggering as that is and as bad as that is, even worse, if something could be worse, is that we are continuing to lose money at the Federal level of almost \$1 billion a day every day. Today we will lose almost \$1 billion in the Federal Government.

We have got to cut spending. Every place I go today, my constituents are saying, cut spending first. All over the Nation we are hearing that cry. In the national media, from Prime Time Live to many other national organizations, we are hearing the cry of reducing spending.

The national polls show that 75 to 80 percent of the American people want us to balance the budget. Yet we cannot do it unless we start cutting someplace. This will save at least \$8.9 mil-

lion. At least it is a start. I urge my colleagues to support his very reasonable effort by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] came to the floor. There has been a question raised here about some of the grants that have been made by the National Endowment for the Arts. I would argue that over its history, we are talking about 100,000 grant applications that have been made by the Endowment. In very few cases has anyone raised a question about the judgment of the Endowment.

In some instances, money is awarded to an artist under the artists program, the new artists program. And we do not know for sure just exactly what they are going to do.

But in order to deal with this issue, as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out yesterday, I want to read this language into the RECORD, he said, and I quote him, and this is the language that was put into the legislation reauthorizing the National Endowment for the Arts, that is, "Obscenity is without artistic merit, is not protected speech, and shall not be funded by the National Endowment for the Arts." As he said, "The debate is over. The debate is over. It is illegal for the National Endowment for the Arts to fund obscenity."

In fact, here in the statute, it says, this is under section (b), "Section 5(d) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

No payment shall be made under this section except upon application therefor which is submitted to the National Endowment for the Arts in accordance with regulations issued and procedures established by the chairperson. In establishing such regulations and procedures, the chairperson shall ensure that "artistic excellence and artistic merit are the criteria by which applications are judged, taking into consideration general standards of decency and respect for the diverse beliefs and values of the American public; and (2) applications are consistent with the purposes of this section. Such regulations and procedures shall clearly indicate that obscenity is without artistic merit, is not protected speech, and shall not be funded. Projects, productions, workshops, and programs that are determined to be obscene are prohibited from receiving financial assistance under this act from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the exhibition which was referred to in the debate during the course of this as being an indecent exhibition was not paid for by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is, we have a panel sys-

tem which consists of some of the very best people in this country who review these applications for funding very closely. The record, over a period from 1965 to 1993, is extraordinary. The amount of money in this budget today is below the 1992 funding level. Congress has cut this budget back, has reduced this funding.

The other thing is, if we factor in inflation, we are continuing to erode the amount of money that is there for the National Endowment for the Arts. I frankly am embarrassed that we are not doing more for the arts in this country than we are. So I would urge my colleagues, knowing full well that the gentleman is offering a sincere amendment, not an amendment to eliminate the arts but a sincere effort to reduce it, but I think the committee, again, has done a good job. We have done the work. We have looked at the fiscal realities. We have held the funding down.

I would urge the House to reject this amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, whether we are talking about direct or indirect taxpayer support of pornographic arts, it amounts to the same thing, as far as I am concerned. The gentleman over here keeps saying that none of the money that went from the National Endowment for the Arts went to fund this pornographic art exhibit at the Whitney Museum. The fact of the matter is, let me state this clearly, like the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] did, \$200,000 of taxpayers money went to the Whitney Museum.

The Whitney Museum put on this exhibition that has a young woman urinating in the toilet, a 3-foot mound of excrement, a dismembered sculpture of two women having oral sex, and on and on. Maybe there was not a direct subsidy of that art, but the fact of the matter is the museum that gave this demonstration or gave this exhibition was being funded by the National Endowment for the Arts.

The American taxpayers do not want their tax dollars spent for that. Very pure and simple, if my colleagues go out to any district in the country and start talking about this thing, they do not want direct or indirect subsidies of pornographic art. We have got enough problems with the fiscal problems of this Nation right now without using taxpayers dollars for this. The debt is \$4.35 trillion; the deficit is running \$300 billion, \$400 billion a year. We are spending taxpayers dollars for this.

Members say it is not undermining the moral fiber of this country. We have more rapes, more sexual crimes, more violent crimes than we have ever had before in the history of this country, and we wonder why it is happening. It is because our kids get a steady

diet of this in the movies and on television and even with our taxpayers dollars directly or indirectly funding this kind of trash.

For the gentleman from Florida to offer a minimal 5-percent cut, I think, is the right direction that this Congress ought to take. Yesterday we had a complete cut of the National Endowment for the Arts. I voted for that, not because I am not for the symphonies or ballets or other forms of art that is helpful to a society like ours, but because we want to send a message to the National Endowment for the Arts that we do not want our taxpayers dollars being spent for this kind of pornography.

We could not get that passed. I submit to my colleagues, a small 5-percent cut will at least send a message to the National Endowment for the Arts that we do not want the taxpayers, the hard-earned money of the people of this country going for this kind of trash, directly or indirectly.

I will say to the gentleman one more time, \$200,000 came from the NEA to the Whitney Museum that sponsored this trashy pornographic exhibition.

□ 1110

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] if he has any more speakers.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman I have one more speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has one more speaker, and is entitled to close.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, in order to finish my concluding comments.

Without belaboring this amendment, Mr. Chairman, it is merely a 5-percent reduction. I ask my colleagues who wanted to vote for some type of spending reduction, this is their opportunity. I think that the debate has shown that most programs in Congress have been reduced. This is one that should be.

The argument that the private sector is not providing \$9.2 billion, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has pointed out, maybe it is not \$9.2 billion, maybe it is \$9 billion, but at any rate, it is a multiple of what the Federal Government has been doing. Before this whole program was started under President Lyndon Johnson, we were able to fund the arts adequately through private funds.

My position is that this is a modest reduction, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, respecting what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]

has said about the funds going to the Whitney, the Whitney receives both public funds and receives private funds. Public funds were not used for this exhibition. Private funds were used for this exhibition. If I remember the arguments made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and by those who speak, as he does, against the arts ordinarily, he said, "I do not care what you do with your private funds, you can do anything you like, you cannot do it with public funds."

Public funds were not used for this purpose. The Whitney used private funds for that purpose. The gentleman may think, as he does, that money is fungible and if we had not given this money, the NEA money, the exhibition would not have taken place.

The exhibition would have taken place without the NEA funds, because it was financed by private funds.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the arts are considered an integral part of a student's education. I quote from the speech of the Secretary of Education, Mr. Riley, on March 17, 1993, when he said: "Our literature, paintings, dance, and music are part of what defines us as Americans. Those subjects are just as important as history, politics, and geography in understanding what it means to be an American."

I would add science to that, Mr. Chairman. The National Science Foundation receives \$3 billion a year for distribution, for its grants and for education in the sciences and mathematics throughout the country. Yet we compare the paltry sums that the arts receive for education with the amount of education that is financed by the National Science Foundation.

I think our education requires the well-roundedness that the arts bring to this. I have no opposition or hostility to the National Science Foundation grants for education purposes. I think they are excellent. I think we have to establish a foundation in the sciences and in mathematics, but I believe also that we have to teach the arts; that we deprive our children of this country of the opportunity of listening to Mozart and to Beethoven and to the great composers, and to see the artists as they go to the museums, the Impressionists and everybody else, if we approve a cut of the kind of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

AYES—240

Allard	Goodling	Ortiz
Andrews (TX)	Gordon	Orton
Applegate	Goss	Oxley
Archer	Grams	Parker
Armey	Grandy	Paxon
Bacchus (FL)	Greenwood	Payne (VA)
Bacchus (AL)	Gunderson	Penny
Baker (CA)	Hall (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Baker (LA)	Hamilton	Petri
Ballenger	Hancock	Pickett
Barcia	Hansen	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Hastert	Porter
Bartlett	Hayes	Portman
Barton	Hefley	Poshard
Bateman	Heger	Pryce (OH)
Bentley	Hoagland	Quillen
Bereuter	Hobson	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hoekstra	Rahall
Bliley	Hoke	Ramstad
Blute	Holden	Ravenel
Boehlert	Huffington	Regula
Boehner	Hunter	Ridge
Bonilla	Hutchinson	Roberts
Brewster	Hutto	Roemer
Browder	Hyde	Rogers
Brown (OH)	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Inhofe	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Inslee	Roth
Buyer	Istook	Roukema
Callahan	Jacobs	Rowland
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Camp	Johnson (GA)	Santorum
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Cantwell	Kanjorski	Schaefer
Chapman	Kaptur	Schiff
Coble	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	Kim	Shaw
Combest	King	Shays
Condit	Kingston	Shuster
Cooper	Klug	Sisisky
Costello	Knollenberg	Skelton
Cox	Kyl	Slattery
Cramer	Lambert	Smith (MI)
Crane	Laughlin	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Lazio	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Levy	Smith (TX)
de la Garza	Lewis (FL)	Snowe
Deal	Lightfoot	Solomon
DeFazio	Linder	Spence
DeLay	Lipinski	Spratt
Derrick	Livingston	Stearns
Diaz-Balart	Lloyd	Stenholm
Dickey	Long	Stump
Dooley	Manzullo	Sundquist
Doolittle	Margolies-	Swett
Dornan	Mezvinsky	Talent
Dreier	Martinez	Tanner
Duncan	McCandless	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McCloskey	Taylor (NC)
Edwards (TX)	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	McCrery	Thomas (WY)
English (OK)	McCurdy	Thornton
Everett	McDade	Thurman
Ewing	McHale	Torkildsen
Fawell	McHugh	Trafigant
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Upton
Fingerhut	McKeon	Valentine
Fish	McMillan	Visclosky
Fowler	McNulty	Volkmer
Franks (CT)	Meyers	Vucanovich
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Walker
Frost	Michel	Walsh
Galleghy	Miller (FL)	Weldon
Gallo	Minge	Wise
Gekas	Molinari	Wolf
Geren	Montgomery	Wynn
Gibbons	Moorhead	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Murphy	Zeliff
Gillmor	Myers	Zimmer
Gingrich	Neal (NC)	
Goodlatte	Nussle	

NOES—184

Abercrombie	Barca	Beilenson
Andrews (ME)	Barlow	Berman
Andrews (NJ)	Barrett (WI)	Bilbray
Baessler	Becerra	Bishop

Blackwell	Hefner	Pallone
Bonior	Hilliard	Pastor
Borski	Hinchey	Payne (NJ)
Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Pelosi
Brooks	Horn	Peterson (FL)
Brown (CA)	Houghton	Pickle
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bryant	Hughes	Rangel
Byrne	Jefferson	Reed
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Reynolds
Carr	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Castle	Johnston	Romero-Barcelo
Clay	Kennedy	(PR)
Clayton	Kennelly	Rose
Clement	Kildee	Rostenkowski
Clinger	Kleczka	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Klein	Rush
Coleman	Klink	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Kopetski	Sanders
Collins (MI)	Kreidler	Sangmeister
Coppersmith	LaFalce	Sawyer
Coyne	Lancaster	Schenk
Danner	Lantos	Schroeder
Darden	LaRocco	Schumer
de Lugo (VI)	Leach	Scott
DeLauro	Levin	Serrano
Dellums	Lewis (CA)	Sharp
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Shepherd
Dicks	Lowey	Skaggs
Dingell	Machtley	Skeen
Dixon	Maloney	Slaughter
Durbin	Mann	Smith (IA)
Edwards (CA)	Manton	Stark
Engel	Markey	Stokes
English (AZ)	Matsui	Strickland
Eshoo	Mazzoli	Studds
Evans	McDermott	Stupak
Farr	McKinney	Swift
Fazio	Meehan	Synar
Fields (LA)	Meek	Tejeda
Filner	Menendez	Thompson
Flake	Mfume	Torricelli
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Ford (MI)	Mineta	Underwood (GU)
Ford (TN)	Mink	Unsoeld
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Velazquez
Furse	Mollohan	Vento
Gejdenson	Moran	Washington
Gephardt	Morella	Waters
Gilman	Murtha	Watt
Glickman	Nadler	Wheat
Gonzalez	Natcher	Whitten
Green	Neal (MA)	Williams
Gutierrez	Norton (DC)	Wilson
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Woolsey
Hamburg	Obey	Wyden
Harman	Oliver	Yates
Hastings	Owens	

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Kolbe	Torres
Bevill	Lehman	Towns
Conyers	Packard	Waxman
Faleomavaega	Pomeroy	Young (FL)
(AS)	Sarpalius	
Henry	Tauzin	

□ 1134

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kolbe for, with Mr. Waxman against.
Mr. Packard for, with Mr. Ackerman against.

Mr. SHARP changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, DOOLITTLE, and ORTIZ changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 84, after line 18, insert:

SEC. 308. None of the funds in this Act may be used to plan, prepare, or offer for sale tim-

ber from trees classified as giant sequoia (*sequoiadendron giganteum*) which are located on National Forest System or Bureau of Land Management lands.

Mr. YATES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that prohibits the use of any of the funds in the act to plan, prepare, or offer for sale timber from trees that are classified as giant sequoias. I do not think all of you who have not seen the giant sequoias know what magnificent specimens they are. Too many have already been cut in the harvests that have taken place. Only a few remain. This amendment seeks to protect those that remain from being cut down in the future.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to inquire whether this is an amendment to the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has offered the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of California. In what way does this relate to section 308 of title III, which was subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriations bill yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot interpret the amendment. No point of order was made against the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I understand that.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Certainly I yield to the chairman.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will tell the gentleman that the point of order was addressed to the section as a whole, and the section as a whole contained the following language: that is, this language plus, "Until an environmental assessment has been completed and the giant sequoia management implementation plan is approved," and that is obviously legislative language. This is not. I am offering this as a funding limitation.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Could the chairman tell me how this amendment affects the mediated settlement between environmentalists and the Forest Service dealing with the protection and preservation of the giant sequoia?

Mr. YATES. They are working on an environmental assessment at the present time.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The mediated settlement has been agreed upon. How does this affect that mediated settlement?

Mr. YATES. I do not think it affects it in any way.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The chairman does not think it affects it?

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman is asking me that question, I will tell the gentleman I think that the language that was stricken yesterday which carried conditions may have had something that the gentleman wanted, that conditioned the action. This says that none of the funds may be used to destroy those trees.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Can the chairman tell me under what law giant sequoias can currently be planned, prepared, or offered for sale?

Mr. YATES. Well, under the general legislation which authorizes the Forest Service to offer timber in the national forests for sale.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Does the chairman know that it is against the law to log giant sequoias? And not only is it against the law to log giant sequoias, but the mediated settlement creates a significant buffer zone around the giant sequoia, and not only is it illegal to harvest giant sequoia, it is illegal to harvest any tree with a diameter greater than 30 inches anywhere near the buffer zone of the giant sequoia.

□ 1140

I need to know the reason for this language, since it is totally superfluous.

Mr. YATES. Well, it may be totally superfluous. The information we have is the giant sequoia is still under threat for destruction of that kind.

Mr. THOMAS of California. The purpose of the mediated settlement was to make sure that they were not under threat.

Mr. YATES. Well, this language goes further and says they shall not be under further threat.

Mr. THOMAS of California. It is against the law to do this.

Mr. YATES. Well, then, none of the funds may be used for that purpose.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the kind of amendment that drives this House crazy. Currently, nothing can be done that this amendment is trying to prevent. You cannot do what the amendment says it wants to prevent from being done.

Now, I guess we can be redundant on every point and every subject in the universe to give somebody some assurance somewhere.

What this body should be doing is dealing with relevancy. This amendment is totally irrelevant to what is going on in the real world.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I commend the gentleman for persisting on this amendment, notwithstanding the fact there are points of order yesterday where he could have, I think, dealt with some of the concerns of the gentleman from California.

The existing limitation, I understand, is a restriction in the appropriation bill today, so one set expires this

year and the agreements, obviously, are administrative agreements, so they do not provide necessarily—I hope ideally they would—but they do not necessarily provide the protection that the chairman rightfully, and the Appropriations Subcommittee, is seeking for these giant sequoias in California.

Furthermore, there are other expenses that are involved in other expenditures that could take place short of cutting the tree.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman on this point.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I should point out to the gentleman from California that I am advised by staff that there is no law on the books forbidding the cutting down of giant sequoias. The only protection the giant sequoias have had over the years is the funds limitation that we have put in our appropriations bill every year, which has had the force of law. There is no law on the books at the present time, I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would urge support for the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused about the form of the amendment, given the discussion the chairman and I had yesterday.

As I understand this amendment, it is a funds limitation amendment. It is therefore an amendment that is supposed to come at the end of the bill after the motion to rise.

The chairman explained to me yesterday that I could not have such a funds limitation amendment to deal with the problems of the Midwest flood because that would not be proper form.

Now the chairman himself comes along and offers a funds limitation amendment on his own, while denying me the opportunity to come to the floor to try to deal with the Midwest flood situation in a responsible way by limiting funding.

Can the gentleman explain to me why it is not proper for this Member to deal with the subject matter of some importance, and the chairman himself offers an amendment that would otherwise not be in order?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has the same rights as I have in offering this amendment. As I understand it, this amendment is subject to a point of order because it was not made after rising. The point of order was not made. Had it been made, it might have been sustained. I do not know that anybody had a point of order against this amendment, because we struck the legislative provisions on a point of order yesterday.

If the gentleman wants to offer his amendment at this time, I propose to make a point of order against it.

The gentleman has the same rights as I have of offering an amendment, subject to the House rules.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

I guess what we are going to have to do then, Mr. Chairman, is demand absolute order in the House, because in all honesty it was not clear what was happening here.

I certainly would have made a point of order if clearly this was happening.

Since the gentleman has indicated that he would not allow others the same rights that he has taken for himself, it seems to me then that we are going to have to make some points of order to prevent this kind of thing from happening on the floor.

It seems to me that what is good for the leaders of the committee out here ought to be good for the rest of the membership in the House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is exactly the fact here. As I explained to the gentleman, it was subject to a point of order.

I have asked unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time, because the gentleman felt that he was unfairly dealt with at the time the amendment was read.

Mr. Chairman, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment at this time and ask that it be presented at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reoffer the amendment?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I reoffer the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES:

SEC. 308. None of the funds in this Act may be used to plan, prepare, or offer for sale timber from trees classified as giant sequoia (*sequoiadendron giganteum*) which are located on National Forest System or Bureau of Land Management lands.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is out of order, because under the rule a limitation amendment cannot be presented until after the motion to rise has been defeated, and, therefore, it is not appropriate to offer this amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLICKMAN). The point of order is conceded, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 15, line 2 after "program" insert the following:

"\$38,400 for a lump-sum payment to Marlene Anita Hudson of Washington, District of Columbia, which payment shall be in addition to any other amount that is otherwise payable under any other provision of law based on the death of James A. Hudson".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is a provision to pay to the widow and the family of a National Park Service employee who for 8 years was a temporary employee of the National Park Service. As a temporary employee, he did not enjoy any of the privileges of permanent employment, and obviously he was continued as a temporary employee during a period when he should have been shifted to permanent employment which would have entitled him to the benefits which are contained in this bill.

He was an employee whose services were described by all those who knew him, by his superiors, by his supervisors, as being super-excellent. He was conscientious. He was industrious. He did good work.

It is the purpose of this amendment to indicate to the Park Service that, the extended use of temporary employees is a practice that ought not to be continued and that, where the Service has situations of this kind of temporary employment, it ought to be corrected.

□ 1150

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes on our side, and 10 minutes on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to object to the amendment. On the other hand, how is that time going to be divided? Is there a Member in opposition?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me say that he may have time on his side and I will take the time on my side, unless he would prefer Mr. REGULA to be in charge.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, we may give the time to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. So the unanimous-consent request is for 10 minutes on each side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] controlling 10 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] controlling 10 minutes, 20 minutes

total debate time on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for his gracious and generous support of the amendment that also has the support of the administration. I will ask unanimous consent that that support be entered into the RECORD.

Members may have read about this man in two front-page stories in the Washington Post and a recent editorial. This amendment, cosponsored by our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], is an important, and small and compassionate one-time measure providing financial relief to the family of James A. Hudson. The amendment calls for a lump sum payment of \$38,400, Mr. Chairman, which is the equivalent of a minimum life insurance benefit from the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Program to Marlene Anita Hudson, the surviving spouse of this devoted Federal worker and family man who left seven children after his recent death occurred on the job. Last week James A. Hudson, a temporary employee of the National Park Service, well known for his work attending the great Lincoln Memorial statue, died while on the job after having worked three shifts over 2 days during the extreme heat of the July 4 holiday weekend. As a temporary employee, even with 8 years of service, James Hudson was not eligible for the basic health care, life insurance, and retirement benefits available to permanent Federal employees. Thus his wife, Marlene, and their seven children cannot receive the usual benefits.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hudson's tragic death points up the serious problem created by Federal agencies who abuse the temporary employee classification by carrying these employees and that employment status for many years while they are denied essential benefits that would otherwise have been awarded to them. Legislation will also be necessary to remedy this situation by providing temporary workers with a basic benefits package. Meanwhile, Mr. Chairman, this is a one-time emergency, compassionate measure, and I will be especially grateful if this body would favorably consider this amendment in that light, as a compassionate measure necessary to assist the widow and the seven Hudson children.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for her statement.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is an unusual measure. I hope, and I do not think that anyone intends it to be a precedent for seasonal or temporary employees in the National Government, but the fact is that I know, especially in the land management agencies, that I think there has been misuse, if not abuse, of the use of seasonal and temporary employees. I think it is regrettable because they do not accrue the health insurance benefits, they do not provide the other host of benefits, that we expect would be accorded employees in the fair and equitable manner, and that is a concern. But I think this allows me and others to speak out.

Recently the Park Service, specifically the Vail Conference, talked about these seasonal employees, part-time employees. There is a role for them, but I think it has gone well beyond that.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur with my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO]. I think one of the tragedies of temporary employment, and this is all over the Government; this is not just the Park Service, but this is the Defense Department, this is in every Government Agency; they use temporaries as a way, and this is not a cold-hearted private sector here, but this is the Federal Government not paying retirement benefits, not paying health care benefits, not taking care of the basic requirements for people, and I think this is a demonstration of the concern that this House has about the way we treat temporaries.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committees that have jurisdiction over this will take this step as a first step in trying to correct this problem. I think we have got to give a basic benefit package to temporary workers, and I am glad that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] has raised this issue because I think, as we look at this, we need to think about the rest of the people who work for the Federal Government all over this country, all over the world, who do not get health care, who do not have retirement, who do not have the basic benefit package, and I am certainly glad to vote for this amendment.

However, Mr. Chairman, I hope we can go far beyond this in correcting the problem that faces thousands, if not millions, of people who work for the Federal Government, and I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for having yielded to me.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the director of the United States Office of Personnel Management and the article from the Washington Post entitled "James Hudson in Life and Death":

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT,

Washington, DC, July 15, 1993.

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
Chair, Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NORTON: I have discussed with the Office of Management and Budget your effort to amend H.R. 2520, the Department of Interior Appropriations bill, to provide a payment of \$38,400 to the survivors of James Hudson. I am pleased to advise you that the Administration supports your effort.

Mr. Hudson's tragic death last week has focused our attention not only on the unfortunate circumstances in which his family now finds itself but also on the inequity of denying most benefits to dedicated long-time Government employees whose work is by no means temporary. We pledge our efforts to reform the process of employee temporary employees in the federal workforce and praise your efforts on behalf of Mr. Hudson's survivors.

Please let me know if I may be of some personal assistance in this important effort.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. KING,
Director.

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 1993]

JAMES HUDSON IN LIFE AND DEATH

When President Clinton spoke last year about honoring and rewarding those who work hard and play by the rules, he could have been talking about James Hudson. Mr. Hudson, who died last week while on his job caring for Abraham Lincoln's statue, took his responsibilities seriously, and he worked hard. It was Mr. Hudson and his wife Marlene—and not the government—who raised their five children mostly on his \$29,000-a-year salary. In the end, when his heart gave out after working his third shift in two days in above 90-degree temperatures at his beloved Lincoln Memorial, his family learned that although he worked full-time for the government, he was not entitled to a pension or government-supported health or life insurance. James Hudson wasn't the only American in this fix. There are about 150,000 others in comparable situations. They're called temporary employees—people whose jobs last a year or less. Mr. Hudson had been working temporarily for the U.S. government for the past eight years with no benefits—except the good news that his job was being extended year after year. Even though he never received the benefits, he kept on working hard, starting as a laborer and rising to foreman of a seven-member crew who maintained America's cherished national shrines.

The Lincoln and Jefferson memorials, the Washington Monument—they were all his. Lincoln was his personal responsibility, in the dead of winter or in the heat of summer. That's why after he left his 16-hour shift on the Fourth of July, he was back there sweeping and mopping the marble floors of the Lincoln Memorial. He kept a newspaper photo of himself standing on Lincoln's shoulders hanging on his living room wall. When he wasn't doing the job, he was at home with his children and other neighborhood kids. He did more than serve his country on the Mall; he had served in Vietnam.

In the end, the man who never sought something for nothing got nothing for all he did. His family had to be driven to the funeral by neighbors because they couldn't afford the \$100 for the limousine, what with the

funeral and burial costs. There's a chance the Hudson family may be eligible for benefits under worker's compensation, if the Labor Department agrees with the Park Service that his death was work-related, and we understand they may also be eligible for Social Security benefits. They shouldn't have to wait to find out what the government will do. They are at least entitled to that consideration. But should that be all? We don't think so.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize the compassionate nature of this amendment and will not oppose it, but I do want to point out that I think in conference we should tighten the language so that we do not create a precedent here that would give rise to claims, both prospectively as well as retroactively.

I think also that it is important that the authorizing committees, that have responsibility for establishing the parameters for employment, should address this problem long term so that we are not faced with these kinds of individual choices. This would also give a sense of security to the part-time employees.

So, again we need to ensure that we are not establishing a precedent that would create problems that we do not anticipate today. I think we will have an opportunity to deal with that in conference.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], and I thank the chairman and also the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for their interest in this issue which has come to our attention just in the post-July 4th period. I also thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], for his cooperation and his concern in this issue as well.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] have explained, this is a straightforward amendment. We are asking the House to set aside in the appropriations bill for the operation of the National Park System the sum of \$38,400. This money would provide the family of James A. Hudson a lump sum payment that approximates the amount that would have been paid to the family, had Mr. Hudson been allowed to participate in the basic Federal employees group life insurance program.

In dollar amounts, this amendment is very modest in comparison to the spending we are usually debating on this floor. The arithmetic we often use to round off some spending levels, accounts for far more than the \$38,400 we are proposing. Certainly, in the context

of this \$13.4 billion bill, it's almost insignificant.

But, to a recent widow and her now fatherless seven children, this amendment is significant. It is important. It says that Government is not a calloused employer. It says that James A. Hudson was an appreciated and valued employee of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain I was not the only Member of this House to return from my district after our July 4th recess to read of James Hudson's death and, then, to be shocked that the family of this dedicated, exceptional employee—a decorated veteran of the Vietnam war—was not entitled to any survivors' of life insurance benefits because he had been exploited by his employer for 8 years as a temporary full-time employee.

Let me repeat that. Mr. Hudson was a temporary employee for 8 years. A temporary Federal job is defined as having a duration of less than 1 year. There's something wrong with those numbers and the system that allows them.

Working to address this situation during the last couple of days, I've been told time and time again by some of my colleagues that facing up to Mr. Hudson's situation would be opening a can of worms, setting a precedent for other Federal employees.

Well, I say to my colleagues, this is a can of worms that we should open wide and clean out. We're not elected to ignore problems; I always understood that we were here to try to address them.

I fully realize that Federal agencies have been using temporary employees to stretch their budgets. It was reported to me that there are as many as 145,000 temporary full-time employees in the Federal work force at this time. Many of them could be in the same situation as Mr. Hudson, working long and hard without even the chance to participate in benefit programs and protect their families.

The Federal Government should not be taking advantage, and exploiting employees in this fashion. To the contrary, we should be setting the example.

As a Republican—and I speak to my fellow Republicans—we oppose mandates on private-sector employers, because we argue that they know the right thing to do, to take care of their work force. How can we expect this to be true in the private sector, when it is not true in the example we set in the Government?

Obviously, we cannot afford a fix for all the past mistakes and mistreatment, even if it was possible to identify those workers. But we can fix this oversight and abuse from this point forward. Mr. Hudson's death, leaving seven children, brought the problem into full light. Let's fix it for his family and from this point forward.

I joined with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] to draft this amendment, because I have assurances from her that her Post Office and Civil Service subcommittee, along with Mr. MCCLOSKEY's subcommittee, is moving forward immediately with legislation to address the issue of full-time, but temporary workers. There was, in fact, a hearing on this issue just recently. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the ranking member of Post Office and Civil Service, also tells me of his plans to move forward with legislation on the issue.

Mr. Hudson's widow and seven children are strapped financially now. Thankfully, they have Ms. NORTON on their case trying to expedite release of Mr. Hudson's last paycheck and trying to expedite the application for Social Security and, possibly, workers' compensation benefits. This amendment is the quickest, surest way to get this modest payment to the family. It is the right thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for yielding this time to me, and I applaud the offering of this amendment from the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and the chairman of the subcommittee. This is an issue that has confronted the Congress for some time.

Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues will recall in the defense appropriation bill the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and I put in an amendment there calling upon the Defense Department to review this policy with reference to temporaries, and that review has been completed, and, as a consequence, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] called a subcommittee meeting a few weeks ago in which this matter was very strongly viewed, and we had assurance by the Office of Personnel Management that they would take strong measures to correct this problem. So, I am really appreciative of the initiative of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] here in presenting this issue and bringing sharper focus to the problem.

Mr. Chairman, there are tens of thousands of employees in the Federal Government, in all departments, who are confronted by this issue of being a temporary year, after year, after year and not having the benefits of health care, and insurance and retirement.

□ 1200

There are many in my district who brought this issue up, and as a consequence I introduced a bill. I am really very, very grateful that finally we have some momentum created here to correct this problem. With the tragedy

of this death here in the District of Columbia of a temporary who had worked as long as 8 years without any health coverage, we might conclude perhaps that the lack of health coverage caused his death, when one stops to think of the fact that he had no protection whatsoever in terms of his own family.

So I call upon this Congress not just to support this amendment and then walk away from the issue but to carry it forward and do something and pass a law. My own bill says that if a temporary works for 2 years cumulatively, he should automatically be given the protection of health coverage. I think that kind of support is required here for our temporaries.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

I have a question for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I do not plan on opposing this amendment, but I have this question: I understand this is just for one time and does not set precedents?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me say that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I laud both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], but let me say this: The amendment brings attention to the fact that we are talking about Federal employees right now, but in the upcoming health care plan of the President's wife, I am sure there would be a lot of small businesses who are going to do the same thing to avoid costs. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee to also look at the cost of any measure such as this. When we have been increasing the size of Government, I would ask the gentleman to look at the cost to the American taxpayer and also the cost to small business, because it could affect them desperately also.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will look at the form of the amendment, it is to be taken out of existing funds, so there would be nothing else added for expenditures from the budget.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

No one is going to oppose this particular item for this particular family as a hardship case that needs to be addressed, but I do think the House had better focus on a couple of things here.

First of all, we are establishing a precedent of going around the House rules as they are presently written.

This kind of a bill would normally go through the channels of a private bill. It is exactly that kind of thing that the private bill calendar is established for, and we are doing an end run around the rules of the House, around the process, in order to get by that particular factor.

The second thing is that I enjoy all the nice features here about these temporary employees and that this is not going to set a precedent, and I think it is something that has to be corrected. But we are in the process of creating 25,000 new temporary employees without these kinds of protection in the national service bill. So all the Members who have been up here making these kinds of statements, when it comes to the national service bill, I wonder where they are going to be because we are creating exactly that kind of temporary employee there who also is not going to have these kinds of protections, and the question is going to be, when one of them finds themselves in a circumstance like this, whether or not we are going to be back here citing this precedent and suggesting that for these national service employees we ought to be doing the same thing as we did in this particular case, that could amount to real big expenses that we are not going to be able to take out of existing funds.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question specifically: Is this in any way a precedent in any way, shape, or form that could be used in the future for people engaged in national service should that become the law of the land?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is an emphatic "no." And if the gentleman will yield further on the first point, I recognized when I offered this amendment that it was subject to a point of order, because, as the gentleman pointed out, it did violate the House rules. In accordance with the gentleman's admonition earlier, order had been declared, and no Member made a point of order on it. We have had our debate on the amendment, and in response to the gentleman's second point, the answer to that again is "no."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and let me say that the gentleman is absolutely correct, that we specifically decided not to raise a point of order. But I did raise the point that there are processes that can be utilized for exactly this kind of case, and we would be better off in most cases sticking to the process rather than going for these ways around what is the legitimate aims of the House to deal with emergency situations.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for this time.

I appreciate the contours of this very important debate. I might say that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], and I have been working on these concerns for some time.

The simple fact is that this process is an outrage. Some of us had 19 and 20 and 21 years as cases in our districts in which people have been strung along as temporary employees with no protection.

This afternoon, at 2 o'clock, Jim King, the Director of OPM, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], and I will be announcing improvements to be made right now, particularly as to health insurance and life insurance for temporary employees. Later on today a bill will go in to take care of more long-range and permanent measures in effect to abolish and reform this totally oppressive system.

I would ask for the support of the House, and I will ask for cosponsors of the legislation immediately.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I would say this: It does not go to national service, those who are not career employees.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, and I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the Members on both sides for their remarks and their compassionate treatment of this bill and indicate that I am a cosponsor, along with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY], of a bill that we are going to entitle the James Hudson Temporary Employee Equity Act of 1993.

We have a bill that is not going to cost the Government anything but would allow true temporary employees to buy into the Federal employee benefit program themselves after 6 months and pay for their own health benefits. It would also allow them to buy life insurance after their first day of employment, and if Mr. Hudson could have bought his own life insurance policy, of course his seven children would not be left in the condition they will be in.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the subcommittee chairman once again and the Members on both sides for the way in which they have treated this issue.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 61, line 23, strike "\$19,366,000" and insert "\$18,091,000".

Page 66, after line 22, insert the following:

REVISION OF AMOUNTS FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The amounts otherwise provided by this title for the Department of Energy are revised by reducing the amount made available under the heading "Fossil Energy Research and Development" by, and also transferring from the remaining amount made available under such heading to the appropriation for "Energy Conservation" an additional, \$24,873,000.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the question be divided on this amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the amendment in its present form is subject to a question of division.

The CHAIRMAN. As between the two parts of the amendment, the one on page 61, line 23, and the one on page 66, after line 22, it would be subject to a division of the question. Those two parts would be subject to a division, if that is how the gentleman is offering this amendment.

Mr. WALKER. All right. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Will the Chair describe again just what the parliamentary situation is? What amendment are we considering at the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. A demand for a division of the question has been made. The first vote will occur on the portion of the amendment which is on page 61, line 23, the striking and inserting of dollars. The second vote will occur on page 66, after line 22, inserting the following.

Mr. YATES. I thank the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

□ 1210

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me explain the situation we have. We have two parts to the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, we do not have a copy of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will provide a copy.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I reserve a point of order at this moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has begun debate. We have passed the point of a point of order on this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, had we really?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] asked unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, so debate had begun on the amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is all right and this would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain the amendment. Because of the requested division, it is in two parts. The first part simply brings an aluminum research program down to the present authorized level. Essentially it strikes the figure \$19,366,000 and inserts \$18,091,000. The sum of \$18,091,000 is the present authorized level for the program, and so that is what it does.

The second part of the amendment is the real thing that I am doing here. What that does is cuts about \$50 million from the fossil energy research and development program by cutting coal R&D and fossil operating expenses consistent with President Clinton's request. But at the same time what it does is puts some of the money back into the conservation program. So what you get is a cut in the coal R&D, but at the same time it puts the money into energy conservation.

The reason for this cut is again going to the authorizing intent. When we had an authorization bill we decided that the coal research program should be at a particular level. This committee bill exceeds that by about \$50 million.

I am attempting to bring the figure back down to the authorized levels, and at the same time though put the money back in that we had intended for conservation programs and so on.

The result of this is that it is savings of about \$25 million. It is about \$25 million also going then to conservation. The whole thing puts the appropriations bill, both in conservation and in coal R&D, in line with where the authorizing committee had its bill when we passed the Energy Policy Act.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to read the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and I must tell the gentleman I do not understand it. If the gentleman will refer to the wording of his amendment, I do not see where in there the designation of the amount sought to be cut is. If the gentleman will examine the amendment,

let me give him the amendment that I received.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I have seen the amendment. I am told this was drafted by legislative counsel and was drafted, in all honesty, as a way of attempting a division of the question on the fossil energy program. It is done by transferring money from the fossil energy research and development account to the energy conservation account in the amount of \$24,873,000.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, to be controlled equally by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to address this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that I do not understand this. I have never seen an amendment like this. It says:

The amounts otherwise provided by this title for the Department of Energy are revised by reducing the amount made available under the heading "Fossil Energy Research and Development" by, and also transferring from the remaining amount made available under such heading to the appropriation for "Energy Conservation" an additional, \$24,873,000.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield on that point, I now sought clarification on it, and the way the wording is, if you take a look at the comma, what it assures is that the account is cut by \$24,873,000, and there is also transferring money by that amount. So you cut it by and also transfer from the remaining amount another amount equal to that. So you have a reduction of the amount by \$24,873,000, and you also have a transfer from the remaining money of that \$24 million.

It is not the same amount of money. It is a total of \$49 million.

Mr. YATES. In other words, it is double this figure?

Mr. WALKER. It is double that figure, because you are transferring that amount of money out of the remaining accounts and you are also cutting the fossil energy research and development by that amount.

Mr. YATES. If I understand correctly, the purpose of the gentleman is to cut the energy conservation accounts.

Mr. WALKER. No. I am cutting the fossil energy research and development account by that amount, and I am transferring an amount of almost \$25 million into energy conservation. So it pumps up the energy conservation number and reduces by \$49 million all told the fossil energy research and development account.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to this, because what it does is it takes money out of very important ongoing research, and that is coal research which I think is important not only for the United States, but for our world leadership in improving the global environment.

Many of the emerging countries are depending on coal as a fuel for the production of electricity of many, many years to come, and they look to the United States for leadership in developing technologies that will allow them to burn this coal in an environmentally safe manner.

Now, we can say that what happens in China, or Indonesia, with the fourth largest population, is immaterial, but that simply is not true.

We have heard a lot about the global environment, and here is a classic example of ways in which it will be abused if we do not continue the basic research.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that coal research in this bill is 8 percent below 1993 and 23 percent below 1992. If we cut further, we are going to damage our ability to develop clean burning coal techniques.

It does provide for cost sharing. I think that is an important element. Yesterday we eliminated oil shale, research, as a future source of energy. To now take a big hit on coal research would be in my judgment a great mistake environmentally.

As we well know, China is a fast growing economy. They depend largely on coal as their source of energy, and they look to the United States not only just for leadership in technology, but it is a big market for American technology.

Earlier today one of our colleagues pointed out that we have a deficit balance of payments with China and it will probably be a growing problem. This offers an opportunity to sell them this technology that is developed as a result of our fossil energy research successes. I think as a policy issue it would be a great mistake for this body to reduce, even further than the committee has done, our commitment to coal research and to the development of clean burning and more efficient technologies for the use of this fuel.

Even the United States has coal as its greatest source of energy in terms of Btu's. Therefore, just from the standpoint of our own country, it is very important that we continue this research in coal burning technology.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to

say a few words about this. Normally I would not be identified with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] in support of a purely cutting amendment, but in this particular case the amendment combines two virtues. It actually cuts \$25 million approximately out of the figure, and then it readjusts the remaining amount about another \$25 million from coal research, which I have supported in the past, but which in this bill is something like \$40 million over what the President has requested.

□ 1220

I am supporting a transfer of about \$25 million to the Conservation Act, which funds a number of very important initiatives.

One of the previous speakers has indicated how important coal research is in terms of meeting the needs of the Third World, such as China and so forth. I want to assure all of the Members that there is nothing more important than the research which allows us to develop the technologies for conservation and for alternative forms of energy which will be able to supplant the use of coal in the Third World. This will end up giving a market to the United States far greater than any coal market. We are not going to sell much coal to China or any other place, because they have the coal. But they will buy the technology, which will substitute for coal and which will allow them to conserve in their overall use of energy.

It is for this reason that I am supporting this kind of an amendment, which actually reflects the priorities set by this House in the energy policy bill which we passed last year.

This change, and I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for it, reflects the administration's views. It rebalances the allocation of funds to conform to what the President wants.

I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to this amendment.

I would say to the Members of the House of Representatives, we are talking about an industry in America which is on the ropes. We are talking about an industry where because of our Clean Air Act and a lot of changes in our energy demands, coal production in America is threatened.

I live in a State that is one of the major coal producers in our Nation.

I can tell Members over the last 12 years what has happened in my State. We have gone from 20,000 coal miners in Illinois to 8,000 coal miners. These are men and women who work hard for a living and are losing their jobs because of Federal legislation and our

lack of research to find new technology to use this coal.

That plea may fall on deaf ears in this Chamber, because there are Members who have bases being closed and are losing jobs right and left. But if Members do not feel for the families that are involved here, and I do, but if they do not feel for them, think about the future of this country if we ignore this energy resource.

We are still dependent on foreign energy resources, a dependence which drags us into wars, which costs us dearly, which literally threatens the lives of our children. Can we afford \$50 million in research to find safe, clean ways to use American coal? We can find billions of dollars to fight a war in the Middle East. We cannot find \$50 million for research? We certainly can.

I urge the Members of the House, take this amendment seriously. Defeat the Walker amendment. Reduce our dependence on foreign energy.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. First, because I believe we have to begin reducing the Government's role in these types of activities and, second, the money should be used in part to reduce our Federal deficit.

One thing I would like to talk about is, I received a copy of the National Taxpayers Union letter supporting this amendment itself. It states some key points very well, so I just want to read from that letter.

The President requested \$216 million for clean coal, technology, the intent being to wind down the Government's role in the development of the process and to allow commercial ventures to take over. The Appropriations Committee added almost \$50 million to this total, thereby, subverting the intention that this technology finally be subject to the rigors of the marketplace.

In any year, the goal of cutting the Federal purse strings from a technologically mature project such as clean coal would be desirable. In this fiscal year, however, when Congress faces a \$300 billion plus deficit, this amendment is essential. Supporting your amendment would be an important sign of Congress' intent to assign budgetary priorities and allow the market economy to determine the feasibility and viability of energy technologies.

I strongly support this amendment. First, \$50 million would be cut from coal with \$25 million of that going to spending reductions, \$25 million to conservation R&D. I fully support the intent to get the Government out of the way, turn it over to the private sector.

I commend the gentleman from offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we offer today reduces appropriations for fossil energy research

and development by \$49.7 billion and increases the appropriation for energy conservation programs by \$24.8 million. The remainder of the savings—\$24.8 million are dedicated to budget deficit reduction.

The committee's mark for fossil energy R&D is 22 percent over the administration's request. In my judgment Clinton didn't propose enough spending reductions. We ought to support the President when he tries to save money. Additionally, this appropriation contravenes the intent of the Energy Policy Act which clearly sets a policy for reducing spending on these R&D programs. Furthermore, unlike other Federal science programs, many of the fossil research programs receive a Federal cost share of 70 to 90 percent, depending on the project. It is clearly time, Mr. Chairman, to shift more of the funding of these technologies to the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, we can provide additional funding for programs as long as it is done on a pay-as-you-go basis. This amendment is fiscally responsible because it reduces spending \$25 million while at the same time shifting a comparable amount to energy conservation programs. I urge adoption of the Walker-Penny-Brown amendment.

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this very unwise amendment.

I rise in strong opposition to the Walker amendment to cut \$50 million from the clean coal technology program of the Federal Government. Half of our energy in America comes from coal-fired power plants. Even higher percentages of energy are generated from coal in other nations around the world. Tens of thousands of American jobs are involved in our coal economy. Emissions from coal burning do have impacts on environmental conditions in our Nation and the world. I strongly support every dollar of expenditure for research into coal burning that will clean up emissions. This will support growth of energy generation to boost our Nation's economy. We will also be generating thousands of jobs in the coal industry which will help local economies and expand tax revenues across the Nation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I just want to point out that we are \$123 million over last year for conservation. We are \$15 million below last year on coal research and development. We have \$703 million in here for conservation and only \$173 million for coal research.

I think that the committee bill represents good balanced policy. I just want to clarify that conservation is way up; coal research is down in the committee bill.

If we go with this amendment, it will be totally out of proportion.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman YATES for his efforts in bringing the bill before us today. This is a compromise amendment to provide reallocation of funding within the Department of Energy and I rise in support of the amendment. The proposed transfer would provide funding to restore essential conservation research and development activities and to fund high-priority areas that we authorized in the Energy Policy Act. This could include funding for buildings, industry, and the transportation programs including advanced materials and manufacturing, and to restore funding for the electric and Hybrid Vehicle Program.

The amendment also contributes to deficit reductions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

□ 1230

Mr. WALKER. I would ask the Chair, do I have 2½ minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has one speaker remaining. I would ask the gentleman, is that correct?

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, yes, that is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of those situations when there seems to be some confusion about who makes policy in the House and who decides on funding levels. The policy with regard to where we are going with our energy programs was established in the Energy Policy Act. Under the Energy Policy Act, our intention was to move us away from more and more of these mature technologies, move them on into industry, and they have more in the way of research and development in some of the new areas, such as energy conservation.

That is exactly what the authorizing committees decided to do. We, too, hold hearings on these things. We, too, make decisions. We, too, decide what are the priority efforts for the country.

We have decided that we ought to move away from some of the mature technologies that have been developed in coal R&D and move toward energy conservation efforts and toward some of the newer technologies that are necessary for the country.

This amendment is in line with that authorizing intent. This amendment takes money out of an area where the authorizing committee thought we ought to begin to move down the funding level, puts money into the areas

where we thought we ought to move up the levels of funding. At the same time, what we are able to do is cut some spending, in line with what the Clinton administration has requested.

I would say to my colleagues, what they get out of this particular amendment is a \$25 million cut in terms of deficit reduction. At the same time they get \$25 million more in energy conservation, and it comes out of an account that the authorizers have decided is an account that should begin coming down in cost. That particular account is one which the Energy Policy Act said should be dropped, so we are in line, then, with the authorization, and at the same time, I think, achieving something in both deficit reduction and in better energy conservation for our future.

I would ask for the Members' support of this bill. It is a good measure, I think, environmentally; it is a good measure economically; and it does meet the intent of the law that Congress endorsed just a matter of months ago in energy policy.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

All over this country, Mr. Chairman, there are coal-producing communities which stand, not on the brink of economic disaster, but in the midst of economic disaster. A once-proud heritage of working people, whose livelihood and contribution to the prosperity of this country has been to go down into the belly of the Earth and bring up the coal that has supplied the energy needs of this country for years, these proud people and the main streets they have supported all across rural America are now finding their lives, and their main streets, shutting down.

Why? Has some economic colossus across the oceans outproduced them? No. Has some other energy source proved itself to be more valuable in supplying the incredible amounts of electrical power this Nation uses? Can solar, can wind, can hydroelectric, can nuclear? No. We have enough coal reserves to supply our total energy needs in this country for 200 years.

What is the problem? The problem is, many of these reserves cannot be used because the sulfur content of the coal is too high to comply with Federal clean air standards. Mr. Chairman, there is not a single coal miner, not a single coal operator, not a single coal user in this country who does not want the cleanest air possible. We have families, too. We want a safer, cleaner

world for our children just like every American. But we have to know how to clean this coal so it can be used safely to benefit our country, to make us less dependent on foreign energy. That is what this bill does. It gives us the opportunity through fossil energy research and development programs to find the technology to clean the coal. That is good for America, unemployment rate 7 percent, but it is better for Perry County, IL, unemployment rate 27 percent; Hamilton County, IL, unemployment rate 26 percent; Saline County, IL, 18 percent. It is good for coal communities all over this country, who suffer at 3 and 4 times the national unemployment rate.

We can stand here in this House of the people today, and with a sharp, sterile, antiseptic cut of the knife, eliminate \$49 million of research meant to help provide jobs for the poorest regions of the country. And we will go home touting our record of fiscal responsibility. But we will not have to look into the eyes of poverty of children in the Mississippi Delta or the Appalachian regions of this country or the Midwest and explain that vote. Vote against this amendment today.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Penny-Walker amendment to cut Federal spending and to improve our energy funding priorities.

This amendment will cut \$49 million from coal-related spending that is over the amount requested by the administration. The Federal Government is supporting cost-share programs with the coal industry to the tune of 70, 80, even 90 percent. This is oversubsidizing a mature technology.

Half of the savings would go to deficit reduction; half of the savings would go to energy conservation programs, including low-income weatherization, conservation R&D, State energy office grants, and much more. Even with this amendment, the Interior Appropriations bill will contain less in it for energy conservation than requested by the President.

The energy conservation programs that will be supported by this amendment are more than just essential energy policy: they are important high-technology and economic development programs. For example, the Massachusetts Energy Advisor Service has used Federal support to identify energy cost-cutting opportunities for 500 companies. One of those companies, Kraft-Sealtest, was able to keep open an ice cream factory saving jobs in Framingham because the energy advisor service was able to identify enough energy-saving opportunities to slash the factory's utility bills. I am including some information in the RECORD on this excellent program.

These are some of the best programs from the taxpayers' point of view: a recent survey found that for every \$1 of Federal funds for State energy conservation grants, the States leveraged \$43 in State, private, and other funds, 43-1. That's not only great energy policy, it's great budget policy.

This amendment will cut Federal spending and restore a stronger balance to energy spending that will lead us into the future with

a proenvironment, proconsumer, probusiness energy policy.

MASSACHUSETTS DIVISION OF
ENERGY RESOURCES,
Boston, MA.
ENERGY ADVISOR SERVICE

The Energy Advisor Service (EAS), a program administered by the Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources, identifies energy cost-cutting opportunities for industries. The Energy Advisors are private-sector engineers contracted to provide custom, on-site engineering. Their cost-effective recommendations are as varied as Massachusetts' industries, ranging from the investigation of industrial process opportunities to cogeneration-feasibility studies. Under EAS, oil overcharge funds (returned to states for restitution to customers overcharged by oil companies in the 1970's) are used to pay over 85% of the cost of engineering analyses of private manufacturing processes.

Over 490 Massachusetts industries have been assisted by the EAS program in identifying energy cost-cutting opportunities at their facilities. Nearly \$60 million in annual savings opportunities were identified for 440 clients. These opportunities had an average payback of 2 years. Manufacturers interested in increasing their economic competitiveness through energy efficiency, should take advantage of this program by contacting William Eddy or Clifford Sullivan at the Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources (617-727-4732).

Statewide

Total number of clients:	
some are in progress	490
Summary for 440 clients:	
Total identified annual savings	\$60,000,000
Cost to install recommended measures	\$108,670,805
Average payback	2 years
Average identified annual savings	\$132,529

MASSACHUSETTS DIVISION OF
ENERGY RESOURCES,
Boston, MA.

DOER/KRAFT-SEALTEST FACT SHEET
Energy efficiency for industry

The Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources (DOER) has been helping Massachusetts industry cut energy costs and become more competitive.

DOER's technical assistance service, known as the Energy Advisor Service (EAS), has worked with over 440 companies to identify approximately \$54 million in annual energy savings.

DOER clients include well known companies such as Digital Equipment Corporation of Maynard, Raytheon Company of Lexington, Acushnet "Titleist" Company of New Bedford, and Polaroid Corporation of Cambridge.

DOER's technical service is flexible and cost effective. The energy advisors, private sector engineers, specialize in eliminating waste in manufacturing processes.

DOER at Kraft-Sealtest

Kraft General Foods is the second largest packaged food company in the world. Kraft-Sealtest in Framingham, Massachusetts is an ice cream and frozen dessert manufacturing plant which produces nearly 20 million gallons of ice cream annually. Kraft-Sealtest products include Sealtest, Breyers, Frusen Gladje, and Light n' Lively ice creams.

DOER served as a catalyst for the dramatic energy efficiency improvements at

Kraft-Sealtest. DOER identified and recommended energy conservation measures that will reduce the plant's energy bills by over \$425,000 per year. DOER then helped to arrange for utility financing of those conservation measures.

Utility incentives for Kraft-Sealtest

Kraft-Sealtest became the first project for Boston Edison's new Energy Efficiency Partnership, a \$213 million plan under which the utility will invest in conservation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the Walker-Penny-Brown amendment which transfers needed Federal funds from coal R&D Programs into energy conservation R&D. This transfer brings the research and development total closer to the administration's request. The amount in the bill for conservation R&D, which is \$703 million, would increase by \$24.8 million. I have just come from a hearing on green technologies. Energy conservation R&D, I hope, will assist the United States in taking the lead in promoting technologies that are good for the environment and the pocketbook.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Walker-Penny amendment to cut \$49.7 million from the DOE fossil energy research and development program. This year, Congress worked hard to increase the administration's request for coal research and development, to boost our Nation's most bountiful energy source and in turn help areas which rely on coal for their source of employment. This amendment would delete one of the most ambitious and important coal research projects, to be located in my congressional district at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important ways to offset loss of use for Illinois coal is to find new markets. This project will turn coal into an environmentally sound form of coke for use in our steel factories and foundries.

To date, our project has received almost \$6 million in Federal funds. Last year, no funds were appropriated in the House but were later restored in a House-Senate conference committee. However, with the appropriation included in today's legislation, Congress is sending a strong signal to the U.S. Energy Department to break ground and move the project forward.

In today's legislation, Congress is speaking loud and clear in saying that we want this project to begin immediately. Congressman GLENN POSHARD, Congressman DICK DURBIN, Congressman SID YATES, and I are dedicated to work with our two Senators to see that this project is equally supported in the other body.

The project, cosponsored by SIU-Carbondale and the Institute of Gas Technology, has been selected by the Department of Energy to demonstrate the mild gasification of coal. While most conventional gasification technologies convert coal to a synthetic gas fuel, mild gasification converts the coal to a char briquette. The primary use for this char will be in the form of coke briquettes for steel factories, an environmentally sound alternative to conventional coke ovens. A team headed by Kerr-McGee is currently under contract with DOE to build a one-ton-per-hour scaleup of

this technology at the Illinois Coal Development Park at SIU-Carbondale, with 20-percent cost sharing provided by the State of Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, this project is a benefit to both the coal and steel industries, and an excellent project for all of Illinois. Construction on the project will begin as soon as DOE completes an environmental review of the project. Today's appropriation would expedite that process, with a potential groundbreaking late in 1993. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and move forward on essential technology to our Nation's future.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my demand for a division of the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] withdraws his demand for a division of the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER), there were ayes 14, noes 11.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 276, noes 144, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

AYES—276

Abercrombie	Darden	Herger
Ackerman	de la Garza	Hinchey
Andrews (ME)	Deal	Hoagland
Andrews (NJ)	DeFazio	Hochbrueckner
Andrews (TX)	DeLauro	Hoekstra
Archer	DeLay	Holden
Armey	Deutsch	Horn
Bacchus (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Huffington
Bacchus (AL)	Dickey	Hughes
Baerles	Dicks	Hunter
Baker (CA)	Dooley	Hutchinson
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Hutto
Ballenger	Dornan	Inglis
Barca	Dreier	Inhofe
Barcia	Duncan	Inslee
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Istook
Barrett (WI)	Edwards (TX)	Jacobs
Bartlett	English (OK)	Johnson (CT)
Barton	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	Everett	Johnson (SD)
Beilenson	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Bereuter	Fields (TX)	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Fingerhut	Johnston
Billakis	Fish	Kennedy
Blute	Flake	Kennelly
Boehlert	Ford (TN)	Kildee
Bonilla	Fowler	Kim
Brewster	Frank (MA)	King
Browder	Franks (CT)	Kingston
Brown (CA)	Frost	Klein
Brown (FL)	Furse	Klug
Bryant	Galleghy	Knollenberg
Bunning	Gallo	Kreidler
Burton	Gejdenson	Kyl
Buyer	Gekas	LaFalce
Byrne	Geren	Lambert
Calvert	Gilchrest	Lancaster
Camp	Gingrich	Lantos
Canady	Glickman	LaRocco
Cantwell	Goodling	Laughlin
Cardin	Gordon	Lazio
Castle	Goss	Leach
Clayton	Grams	Levin
Clinger	Grandy	Levy
Coble	Green	Lewis (CA)
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Lewis (FL)
Combest	Gunderson	Lewis (GA)
Condit	Hall (TX)	Livingston
Coppersmith	Hancock	Lloyd
Cramer	Harman	Machtley
Crane	Hayes	Maloney
Crapo	Hefley	Mann
Cunningham	Hefner	Manzullo

Markey	Petri	Solomon
McCandless	Pickle	Spratt
McCollum	Pombo	Stark
McCrery	Portman	Stearns
McCurdy	Price (NC)	Stenholm
McDermott	Quinn	Studds
McHugh	Ramstad	Stump
McInnis	Rangel	Stupak
McKeon	Ravenel	Swett
McNulty	Reed	Synar
Meehan	Richardson	Talent
Meek	Roberts	Tanner
Menendez	Roemer	Tauzin
Meyers	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Mfume	Ros-Lehtinen	Tejeda
Miller (CA)	Rose	Thomas (CA)
Miller (FL)	Roth	Thornton
Minge	Rowland	Thurman
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Torkildsen
Mollinari	Royce	Unsoeld
Montgomery	Sanders	Upton
Moorhead	Saxton	Valentine
Moran	Schiff	Velazquez
Morella	Schroeder	Vento
Nadler	Schumer	Volkmer
Neal (MA)	Sensenbrenner	Vucanovich
Neal (NC)	Sharp	Walker
Norton (DC)	Shaw	Walsh
Nussle	Shays	Waters
Oliver	Shepherd	Watt
Ortiz	Shuster	Weldon
Orton	Skaggs	Wilson
Pallone	Skelton	Wolf
Parker	Slatery	Woolsey
Paxon	Smith (MI)	Wyden
Pelosi	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Penny	Smith (OR)	Young (FL)
Peterson (FL)	Smith (TX)	Zeliff
Peterson (MN)	Snowe	Zimmer

NOES—144

Applegate	Gilman	Owens
Barlow	Gonzalez	Oxley
Bateman	Goodlatte	Pastor
Bentley	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Berman	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Bishop	Hamburg	Pickett
Blackwell	Hamilton	Pomeroy
Bliley	Hansen	Porter
Boehner	Hastert	Poshard
Bonior	Hilliard	Pryce (OH)
Borski	Hobson	Quillen
Boucher	Hoke	Rahall
Brooks	Houghton	Regula
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Reynolds
Callahan	Hyde	Rogers
Carr	Jefferson	Rostenkowski
Chapman	Kanjorski	Roukema
Clay	Kaptur	Sabo
Clement	Kasich	Sangmeister
Clyburn	Kleczka	Santorum
Coleman	Klink	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	Kopetski	Schenk
Collins (MI)	Lightfoot	Scott
Cooper	Linder	Serrano
Costello	Lipinski	Sisisky
Coyne	Long	Skeen
Danner	Lowe	Slaughter
de Lugo (VI)	Manton	Smith (IA)
Dellums	Margolies-	Spence
Derrick	Mezvinsky	Stokes
Dingell	Martinez	Strickland
Dixon	Matsui	Sundquist
Durbin	Mazzoli	Swift
Edwards (CA)	McCloskey	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McDade	Thomas (WY)
Engel	McHale	Torricelli
English (AZ)	McKinney	Trafficant
Evans	McMillan	Tucker
Ewing	Mica	Underwood (GU)
Fawell	Michel	Visclosky
Fazio	Mineta	Washington
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Wheat
Filner	Mollohan	Whitten
Foglietta	Murphy	Williams
Ford (MI)	Murtha	Wise
Franks (NJ)	Myers	Yates
Gephardt	Natcher	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Oberstar	
Gillmor	Obey	

NOT VOTING—19

Allard	Cox	Hastings
Bevill	Faleomavaega	Henry
Conyers	(AS)	Kolbe

Lehman	Romero-Barcelo	Schaefer
Packard	(PR)	Thompson
Ridge	Rush	Torres
	Sarpalius	Towns
		Waxman

□ 1303

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Waxman for, with Mr. Towns against.
Mr. Kolbe for, with Mr. Rush against.

Messrs. HYDE, PORTER, SUNDQUIST, HOKE, WHEAT, FOGLIETTA, and GUTIERREZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HEFLEY, NADLER, BARCIA of Michigan, NEAL of Massachusetts, VOLKMER, LAFALCE, and Mrs. UNSOELD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VENTO: on page 16, after line 4 insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), \$183,949,000, to remain available until expended of which \$2,000,000 for the Boston Public Library shall be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,500,000 shall be paid to the Army Corps of Engineers for modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989: *Provided further*, That the \$250,000 for Great Basin National Park, Nevada is for the Baker Water and Sewer General Improvement District to cover the additional cost of oversizing the system to serve National Park Service facilities at the administrative site.

Mr. VENTO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the proposed amendment, though I have not, I must confess, seen it. But on the basis of what I believe is in it, I raise the point of order because it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill as well as limitations on expenditures in an appropriation bill, and also constitutes expenditures in an appropriation bill not previously authorized by law.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] makes a point of order against the amendment. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLICKMAN). The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] concedes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an alternative amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VENTO: on page 16, after line 4 insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair or replacement of physical facilities, \$183,949,000, to remain available until expended of which \$2,000,000 for the Boston Public Library shall be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470a.

Mr. VENTO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has raised a point of order on the amendment, and his rights will be protected.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, on my action on a point of order, I struck the Park Service construction account, which had the effect of deleting all the Park Service construction funding for the bill. While I did not prefer this course of action, it was necessary in order to get unauthorized projects and legislative language contained in the National Park Service construction paragraph. The difficulty that arises here with my friend from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] and his point of order against the original amendment is because there was limitation language and other language which was acceptable to me that was not necessarily legislation on an appropriation bill, but it is subject to the limitation language of the previous amendment.

This simply restores the bulk of the funding, when the deletion or modification of two projects that were unauthorized; one was the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route, which has no authorization, and also this amendment then deletes the money for it, \$255,000, and we delete the \$495,000 of the \$670,000 earmarked in the committee report for the Lackawanna Heritage Park. All that will remain is the technical assistance in the amendment at that point.

I would be happy to yield to the chairman of the committee, who I believe supports this amendment.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do support this amendment. I understand that it no longer contains any provisions which

are subject to points of order, and this side of the aisle accepts the amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, we also accept the amendment. It is vitally important that we do these construction projects.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] still insist on his point of order?

Mr. FAWELL. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have just had a short time to review this, but it would seem to me that the language in reference to the \$2 million, the wording, "to remain available until expended, of which \$2 million for the Boston Public Library shall be derived from historic preservation fund pursuant to section 16 U.S.C. 470a," still would constitute expenditures in an appropriation bill not previously authorized by law, in violation and that it would constitute also legislating.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is recognized.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, this is authorized language in terms of the Historic Preservation Act. This is entirely consistent. A certain percentage of the dollars can be—up to 10 percent of the appropriation—can be reserved in this particular manner. In this instance, out of the \$40 million, \$2 million is, in the wisdom of the Appropriations Committee, being utilized for this particular purpose.

So, it is entirely consistent with the authorizing language with which I am familiar and which has been researched and evidenced. So, this language is simply using the authorities and powers that the Appropriations Committee has and is authorized in the law for that particular purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have just one comment: I do make special reference in regard to my questions about legislating in an appropriations bill to the rather ancient law, but it is set forth in section 451 of title XVI, where it states that no expenditure for construction of administration or other building costs in case of any building exceeding \$3,000 shall be made in any national park except under express authority of Congress, and it does appear to me that that express authority—

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, that is not in the amendment at the desk. I regret the gentleman does not have a copy. He is referring to the original amendment, to the second phrase with regard to the act of August 24, 1912. That has been deleted because, and the gentleman is correct, we have a technical corrections bill that will correct that.

□ 1310

Mr. FAWELL. I do understand that was deleted. I agree that that is an important deletion and I accede to that point; however, in reference to the wording about a certain amount of money in the amount of \$2 million remaining available until expended, of which \$2 million for the Boston Public Library shall be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund, it does appear to me that that still would be in violation of existing law which I just referred to. Section 415 still exists.

It does seem to me that it sets forth that there must be express authority from Congress for any expenditure for construction or other building costs exceeding \$3,000. You must have express authority from the Congress.

Mr. VENTO. Well, of course, the express authority is in the Historic Preservation Act that sets aside these dollars in terms of the amounts and authorizes and permits this type of designation in terms of percentage of those funds up to 10 percent of the funds for this purpose.

In other words, the authority is in the Historic Preservation Act, so the gentleman's argument is not a point of order basically. It may go to the substance of the law.

Mr. FAWELL. Well, I am not aware that there is a \$2 million express authority of Congress.

Mr. VENTO. The code citation for the \$3,000 limitation is dollars spent within national parks.

On the Historic Preservation Fund, this is generally money that is not spent within parks, but the dollars are going to the fund to be expended in a different manner; so the limitation the gentleman is applying is an archaic limitation that really only deals with expenditures within the national parks. It does not deal with the Boston historic library.

Mr. FAWELL. Well, I would seek a ruling from the Chair on that point. I do not quite agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLICKMAN). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has a copy of the statute in question, the Historic Preservation Act, which is referred to in the amendment, 16 U.S.C. 470a-e (1), (2) and (3).

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, is that not 451?

The CHAIRMAN. No. It is 470a. It is described correctly in the amendment. The Chair understands that the Boston

Public Library has in fact been designated as a national historic landmark threatened with impairment pursuant to this section of the law.

Therefore, the Chair does not find any problem with respect to this language in terms of legislation on an appropriations bill.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused how made available until expended cannot be legislation in an appropriation bill.

But the point of order I make is that this does go beyond the scope of the bill, and therefore it is not an appropriate amendment because it exceeds the scope of the legislation before us.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GLICKMAN). The Chair would rule that this amendment is germane to the bill as a whole, and the subject matter of funds for construction for the National Park Service contained with respect to the Historic Preservation Act is relevant to the appropriations bill under consideration.

So the Chair would overrule the gentleman's point of order.

Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 31, line 19, delete "and insert "Provided further, That \$650,000 of the funds made available in this Act shall be available as a grant to the Bering Sea Fishermen's Association, of which \$400,000 shall be used for rehabilitation and upgrading of four fish processing facilities in the villages of Quinhagak, Bethel, Mountain Village, and Kotzebue, Alaska and \$250,000 shall be used to market fish products from these facilities."

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would grant \$650,000 to the Bering Sea Fishermen's Association to rehabilitate and upgrade fish processing plants owned by four Native villages in Alaska and to market fish products from these facilities. This grant is needed because these four villages have no other renewable natural resource to develop. The com-

mercial fisheries in these four villages are still developing and would provide economic opportunities to many of the residents. Residents in these four villages support this grant proposal because it would provide many local jobs in the fish processing facilities, freight transportation, and an opportunity for many of the residents to compete in developing commercial fisheries. I cannot stress the many positive economic opportunities this would provide for the residents in these villages.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that, as a general rule, the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee is very reluctant to earmark money for economic development. These are often sound policy reasons for this rule and I respect it. Therefore, I will not insist on my amendment at this time. However, I am sure that the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee are sensitive to the fact that agencies sometimes resist the will of their committee and the Congress in the manner in which they administer grant programs. In the July 1992 Interior appropriations report, the committee directed the BIA to appropriately consider an application for a similar grant. Unfortunately the potential grantee was told that money would not be available because of other worthy priorities, which I suspect amount to informal earmarks from one source or another.

As a result, Mr. Chairman, these worthy and important projects have not been funded and the communities involved have seen their hopes for economic self-sufficiency ignored. I think we owe Native Americans in Alaska a better deal, especially when they have shown the ability, desire, and likelihood of success as these villages have.

Since this is really just the first stage of the process, I will continue to work with the other members of the Alaska delegation and the leadership of the Appropriations Committee to ensure that these villages are treated fairly.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF TEXAS

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Texas: Page 15, line 7, strike "\$1,059,333,000" and insert "\$1,056,207,000".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS] and

10 minutes by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. REGULA. We object, Mr. Chairman. We need more time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, how much time does the gentleman need?

Mr. MCDADE. My understanding is that there is going to be an amendment to the amendment. I do not know that to be the case. It has not been offered yet. So, I would ask if we can limit it to 10 minutes and 10 minutes on this amendment alone.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware there is going to be an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my request to make the time pertain to this amendment alone.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time on this amendment will be limited to 10 minutes on each side on this amendment alone, 10 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS] and 10 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to end what is one of the worst misappropriations of tax dollars in recent memory: Steamtown, USA in Scranton, PA. My amendment would reduce the National Park Service's operations budget by \$3,126,000, the amount requested to operate Steamtown, USA for next year.

Should this amendment be successful, I plan to introduce legislation giving the Park Service the discretion to put this project back where it belongs: in the private sector.

Protecting and preserving our history and national parks is one of the great responsibilities of every Congress. At a time of such scarce Federal resources, Congress must act responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, the case against Steamtown, USA is indefensible. This is not a unique project of great historical importance: America already has 217 railroad museums across the country. Historians have noted that Scranton is of only modest historical significance, as compared to Chicago, recognized as the greatest rail center in the Nation since 1870. St. Louis, historically the second largest hub and already home to a magnificent rail collection, or nearby Baltimore, home of the Mount Clair shops, which date to 1830. These sites were much more important to the growth of the railroads and would be more appropriate sites for a national rail museum.

Steamtown's collection of steam engines is not of great historical significance, either. Over 25 percent of the steam engines at Steamtown are Canadian in origin, not American.

Mr. Chairman, others far more familiar with this project than I echo my sentiments. The president of the National Parks and Conservation Association, a watchdog group overseeing the National Park System, has stated: "Steamtown is nothing more than an abuse of the public trust and should be sidetracked immediately."

The Smithsonian Institution's transportation curator called Steamtown "an inconsequential collection [which] largely duplicates what can be found elsewhere in better condition."

More than once, I have heard the project described as a second-rate collection of trains on a third-rate site. Hardly what one would call an essential part of our National Park System.

Steamtown, however, does stand out in the manner it has been developed and funded. It began as a private venture in Vermont and was moved to Pennsylvania in the early 1980's. When private funding dried up, proponents turned to Congress. So, Congress studied the proposal, received comments from the Park Service, and made a responsible addition to the National Park System, right? Wrong. Steamtown was first authorized in a continuing resolution appropriations bill late in the 99th Congress in 1986, thus bypassing the normal authorizing process and the usual review by the National Park Service. The project has received \$66 million through fiscal year 1993, although it was originally authorized for only \$20 million. This \$66 million is enough to operate the Grand Canyon National Park for roughly 6 years, and Steamtown's operation costs are 10 times per visitor that of Grand Canyon's.

This year, the Park Service has requested \$3.126 million for the operation of Steamtown, an increase of 33 percent from the fiscal year 1993 level. A recent GAO study finds that upon completion the park will need in excess of \$6 million a year for operations. This is not a one-time expense. This is \$6 million every year for a project that is really nothing more than a hometown jobs program.

Mr. Chairman, I am as interested in historical preservation as anyone in this chamber. That is another reason why I offer this amendment. Funding for projects like Steamtown diverts the National Park Service from its historic mission of preserving and maintaining great national parks like Yosemite and Yellowstone. Both of these parks have had to scramble in recent years to provide scaled-back services to users, such as fewer patrols, longer response time to requests, and less interpretive services. Yosemite has actually had to keep closed campgrounds that would nor-

mally have opened this summer. Noting this, the New York Times stated: "it's galling to let a boondoggle siphon even another penny from the Park Service's worthier, maintenance-starved projects." I think it is a travesty that we neglect two of the true gems of our Park System so that we can fund Steamtown.

Mr. Chairman, my opponents will likely rise and proclaim the many supposed merits of this dubious project. But, if it has merits, then surely the private sector will jump at the chance to participate in its operation. This simply is not a project that the Federal Government should be funding.

Steamtown is an embarrassment to the Congress and the National Park System. It is a runaway train loaded with pork barrels, and it's time to throw the switch. I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to briefly set the record straight about who is in favor of this national park: the National Park Service in this administration, the National Park Service in the last administration, the Governor of Pennsylvania who is a Democrat, the former Governor of Pennsylvania who is a Republican, and both Senators from Pennsylvania, one from the Republican Party, one from the Democrat Party. It has had full hearings and full authorizations twice in front of the Committee on Natural Resources.

I deeply regret, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS] has chosen to bring forward this amendment. In my opinion it is destructive, and it is irresponsible.

I have been a Member of this body for 31 years, and I have been a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior for 29 of those 31 years. During that time I think I have served with some of the finest people I have met in this Congress, and I have worked on a bipartisan basis with Members from that side of the aisle, Members from this side of the aisle, to develop the cultural and natural resources of this country. I do not believe there has been a Member that I have not been able to work with in a bipartisan and cooperative spirit.

One of the developments in the system that I view as having great significance is the Steamtown National Historic Site. Let me repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this project was unanimously authorized by the House in 1986 after full hearings in front of the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior Committee and then in the full committee. Funding for construction has already been provided annually in this bill in 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992 with support by the Congress of the United States, and it was reauthorized in February of last year.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, a total of \$66 million of Federal tax funds have been invested, and it has been complemented by \$20 million, roughly \$10 million of which is State funding, \$5 million of which is city of Scranton funding, local funding, and \$5 million of which is private support. All those funds, State, Federal, and local, have been combined to support the construction of this national historic site, and this system is open and running. Last year 400,000 people visited this site from all 50 States in the Nation and from 40 foreign countries, and the comments of the people who go there, who bring their children there, are uniformly, uniformly, complimentary.

I say to my friend that the best definition I ever heard of a national park is a window on the past, and our parks raise various kinds of windows on the past. I say to my colleagues, if you go to Yosemite or Yellowstone, you look through that window, and you see the pristine beauty of this great Nation as God created it. You can go to Independence Park, and you open the window in Independence Park, and you look in, and you see what the Framers of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence did at the time they did it, as they did it. You breathe the air as they breathed it, you see the scene as they saw it. And, when you go to this historic site, you see the Industrial Revolution in this country that took place from 1830 to 1920, as it cannot exist, and does not exist, any place else like this in the country. You can take your children there. They can hear it, they can feel it, they can see it, they can watch the locomotives, the rails, that tied this Nation together and changed us from an agrarian nation into one of the great industrial powers of the world.

Now comes this destructive amendment well after the ninth inning, \$66 million in Federal dollars appropriated, \$20 million in State, and private, and local, and says to the American public, "Keep out. Take out the operating money. We're going to lock the door, turn this into a rust bucket." It says to the people who work there, "Get out on the streets. You have been working here for 7 years, but you're through now. We're not going to use this resource."

If I ever, Mr. Chairman, saw an amendment that was ill considered, penny-wise and pound-foolish, it is this one that tries to say we can save \$3 million by throwing away \$86 million in investments.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I hope this amendment is roundly defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Andrews

amendment to H.R. 2520, which will eliminate funding for the Steamtown National Historic Site.

This site has little purpose or worth, yet Steamtown needs \$3.1 million to operate in fiscal year 1994. To put this into perspective, that is one-sixth of the operating costs of Yellowstone, \$18,247 million; one-fifth of the operating costs of Yosemite, \$15,910 million; and one-fourth of the operating costs of the Grand Canyon, \$11,241 million. Moreover, this site has received over \$66 million to date, enough to run any one of these parks for several years. This is a substantial amount of money for a site that is of modest historical significance and which is at best second rate. To continue to fund this site would be an unwise use of taxpayer dollars.

I urge my colleagues to cut the funding for Steamtown and to support the Andrews amendment.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, the Akron Beacon Journal, which is one of the most respected papers in the State of Ohio, in last Sunday's travel section had a very extensive story about Steamtown U.S.A., inviting the people in Ohio to come and visit. Now I think this points out that here is a facility that will serve millions of people. It is accessible to New York City, to Philadelphia, to Ohio, to many people who otherwise would not have an opportunity to see a facility of this type and who understand that railroads made this Nation great. This is a rich part of our Nation's history. As the Beacon Journal states "Steamtown keeps alive railroad's past and its natural habitat in the Scranton train yard."

□ 1330

It goes on to say in this article, "There are dozens of railroad museums in North America, but Steamtown National Historic Site in Scranton is special." It goes on to say, "The collection of 35 steam locomotives and 78 cars is regarded as one of the country's finest."

I think it would be a tragedy not to make this facility, which is a part of the National Park System, available to those millions of people that will have an opportunity to understand an industry that has built this Nation and is respected particularly in the eastern part of the United States.

I would point out, this has been reauthorized unanimously by this body, so that the authorizing committees, and this body, have made it very clear that they support this as a national park.

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would yield, I would point out to the gentleman that there has not been a reau-

thorization bill passed. It was the subject of House passage, but it was not acted on by the Senate. So in essence it is not authorized.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] knows, we do not control the other body. When the gentleman and I talked about it, we had extensive hearings in front of the gentleman's committee. The bill was reported out and passed by the House without dissent and it got locked up in the other body. We do not control the other body, and that happens a lot around here.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, again this issue is before the House today, not before the other body, and this body has reauthorized this as a national park. I would also point out that this is unique in that there has been a public-private partnership. I think this is the future direction we must go as far as the development of resources of this type, and we will see more of that. The local community and State have put assets into this park to make it a success.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has the right to close debate, representing the committee's position on this issue.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, my four kids love the story of the little engine that could. But Steamtown USA is no bedtime story. It is a nightmare for American taxpayers.

The National Park Service did not originally request this project. In fact, every dollar spent on Steamtown USA is a dollar we cannot spend on national parks and other sites of greater historical significance.

Last year the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considered authorization of the Steamtown project. But it is important to stress that the justification for authorization was to finally put the brakes on this program by limiting its authorization level.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to take the steam out of Steamtown. Over the past several years, as a result of pork-barrel politics at its worst, American taxpayers have forked over \$66 million to finance this venture. Now taxpayers are being asked to foot the bill for the annual operating costs.

It is an embarrassment that this Steamtown train ever left the station. It is a shame that this project has been kept on track with \$66 million of appropriations through the years.

Steamtown is not a national priority, it is a national disgrace. It ought to be derailed. I urge support for the Andrews amendment.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] about the National Park Service not requesting this park. Let me say to the gentleman that we are not sent here to be people who have no authority. We are not sent here to be penny-wise and pound-foolish, as I said earlier.

Mr. Chairman, between 1970 and 1990 there were 116 units added to the National Park Service. Only 56 of those were formally recommended by the National Park Service. Sixty of them were independent and unilateral actions taken by this Congress.

Listen to the ones I am talking about: Golden Gate National Recreation Area. You can turn that over to San Francisco and say, "You pay for it." You can turn over the Padre Islands in Texas and say, "OK, Texas, you have got the money; you pay for it."

You can turn over Big Bend or Golden Gate. Gateway National Park on the east coast was not recommended by the National Park Service. The Lyndon Johnson National Historic Park in Texas was not recommended by the National Park Service; it was done by Congress. Neither was Glen Canyon, nor Tuskegee Institute. Valley Forge was not recommended by the National Park Service. It was done by this Congress. And the list goes on. More than half of the initiatives taken were congressional initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say that Steamtown, USA is no Valley Forge.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, cutting spending is not easy. None of us like to come to the floor of the House and confront a colleague that we all admire and like, who we have a lot of respect for his efforts. The fact that he has tried to push this project through for years is something we do not enjoy taking on. But I think in making the decision that we have to make here today, we have to make one basic choice, and please listen to this choice: Are we willing to raise taxes to pay for Steamtown, yes or no?

If you cannot go home to your constituents and look your constituents in the eye and say that we have got to

raise taxes to build Steamtown, then your vote today is a simple yes vote for the Andrews amendment to terminate this project.

A lot of arguments can be made for this project and other projects. But when we are raising taxes, and no one likes to raise taxes, the gentleman from Kansas does not and the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not either, but when we have a \$300 billion deficit and when we are facing the reality of raising taxes to deal with that, and then dealing with this kind of spending, we have to honestly answer that fundamental question: Will we raise taxes to fund Steamtown, yes or no?

The gentleman from Kansas says no. I cannot go home to Kansas and sell a tax raise in Kansas to fund Steamtown.

Now, if my colleagues can, then they should vote for Steamtown and vote against the Andrews amendment. I am going to vote for the Andrews amendment because I cannot go home to Kansas and sell a tax increase to fund these kinds of projects.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out in Kansas we are spending \$655,000 to operate Fort Larned, with 51,000 visitors. And for Fort Scott, we are spending \$572,000 to operate it, with 87,000 visitors.

Mr. Chairman, you heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] give the number of visitors at Steamtown.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman will check further, the gentleman will find out when it comes to the National Park Service, Kansas gets probably less money in total than any other State of the Union. In terms of the National Park Service, Kansas gets a lot less than most States.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman ought to confer with his delegation about how to remedy that, and not take it out on the rest of us.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is restraining himself from this debate.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is wrong in this debate to try to measure something like Steamtown against some of our great western parks. This seems to be trading off as a West versus East situation.

Mr. Chairman, the railroad train is a very important part of our history. I can tell you as the great grandson of one of the engineers of the great railroads, the Lackawanna Railroad, in the Scranton, Carbondale, Truth areas, that I think this is an important landmark. I think this is important to

save. It is an important part of our history, and it is a very dangerous situation when you start talking about going into a bill and picking out small items, as this is a very small item relative to some of the other items that are in this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] have 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

□ 1340

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to point out to the Members a recent GAO study reflects that the operational expenses for Steamtown, USA, will be into the future \$6.5 million a year. At the same time, taxpayers are spending only \$10 million a year to run Grand Canyon National Park. Something is dramatically wrong here. Let us stop this absolute waste of taxpayer dollars and spend our money where it can be most effective, to help our parks that count and matter.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to bring the direction of the House around a little bit to some of the conversations we have had about taxes. \$3 million is the sum we are talking about here.

Let us look at the State of the gentleman from Texas and the annual operating costs of the park system there: Big Thicket Preserve, \$1.5 million every year; Chamizal National Park, \$1.4 million; Big Bend, \$3.5 million; LBJ Historic Site, \$2.6 million; Padre Island National Seashore, \$2 million; San Antonio Missions, \$1.5 million; Lake Meredith Recreation Area, \$1.6 million; Amistad National Recreation Area, \$1.5 million; Fort Davis National Monument, about \$700,000; the Guadalupe National Park, \$1.4 million; for a grand total of \$17.9 million.

We could make the same argument against all of these. In fact, maybe when we get around to it, maybe what we ought to do is just close all these parks and put a fence around everything.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is roundly defeated. It would throw away \$88 million and almost 10 years of effort in a very inequitable effort.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANDREWS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 229, not voting 18 as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—192

Allard	Gilchrest	Norton (DC)
Andrews (ME)	Glickman	Nussle
Andrews (NJ)	Goodlatte	Payne (VA)
Andrews (TX)	Gordon	Penny
Archer	Green	Peterson (FL)
Bacchus (FL)	Gutierrez	Peterson (MN)
Bacchus (AL)	Hall (TX)	Pomeroy
Baker (LA)	Hamburg	Poshard
Ballenger	Hamilton	Price (NC)
Barca	Hancock	Ramstad
Barcia	Hayes	Ravenel
Barlow	Hefley	Reed
Barrett (WI)	Hoagland	Reynolds
Bartlett	Hoke	Richardson
Bilbray	Holden	Roberts
Bilirakis	Huffington	Roemer
Brewster	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Browder	Inglis	Rostenkowski
Brown (OH)	Inhofe	Roth
Bryant	Inslee	Roukema
Bunning	Istook	Royce
Burton	Jacobs	Sanders
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Sangmeister
Cantwell	Johnson (GA)	Sawyer
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schaefer
Carr	Johnson, Sam	Schenk
Castle	Kaptur	Schroeder
Clement	Kasich	Schumer
Coble	Kennedy	Sensenbrenner
Condit	Kildee	Sharp
Cooper	Kingston	Shays
Coppersmith	Kleczka	Shepherd
Costello	Klug	Skaggs
Cox	Kreidler	Skelton
Cramer	Kyl	Slattery
Crane	Lambert	Smith (MI)
Danner	Lancaster	Snowe
Deal	LaRocco	Spratt
DeFazio	Laughlin	Stark
Derrick	Levin	Stenholm
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dooley	Lipinski	Strickland
Doolittle	Long	Studds
Dornan	Maloney	Stump
Duncan	Mann	Stupak
Edwards (TX)	Manzullo	Sundquist
Emerson	McCandless	Sweet
English (AZ)	McCurdy	Synar
English (OK)	McDermott	Talent
Eshoo	McHale	Tanner
Evans	McInnis	Tauzin
Everett	McKeon	Taylor (MS)
Ewing	McKinney	Thurman
Fawell	Meehan	Torricelli
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Vento
Filner	Mfume	Volkmer
Fingerhut	Mica	Walker
Franks (NJ)	Miller (CA)	Wheat
Furse	Miller (FL)	Williams
Galleghy	Minge	Woolsey
Gekas	Mink	Wyden
Gephardt	Moorhead	Yates
Geren	Neal (MA)	Young (FL)
Gibbons	Neal (NC)	Zimmer

NOES—229

Abercrombie	Blute	Clayton
Ackerman	Boehlert	Clinger
Applegate	Boehner	Clyburn
Armey	Bonilla	Collins (GA)
Baessler	Bonior	Collins (IL)
Baker (CA)	Borski	Collins (MI)
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Combest
Barton	Brooks	Coyne
Bateman	Brown (CA)	Crapo
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Cunningham
Beilenson	Buyer	Darden
Bentley	Byrne	de la Garza
Bereuter	Callahan	de Lugo (VI)
Berman	Calvert	DeLauro
Bishop	Camp	DeLay
Blackwell	Chapman	Dellums
Bliley	Clay	Diaz-Balart

Dickey	LaFalce	Quillen
Dicks	Lantos	Quinn
Dingell	Lazio	Rahall
Dixon	Leach	Rangel
Dreier	Levy	Regula
Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Ridge
Durbin	Lewis (FL)	Rogers
Edwards (CA)	Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	Linder	Rose
Farr	Livingston	Rowland
Fazio	Lloyd	Roybal-Allard
Fields (LA)	Lowey	Rush
Fish	Machtley	Sabo
Flake	Manton	Santorum
Foglietta	Margolies-	Saxton
Ford (MI)	Mezvinisky	Schiff
Fowler	Markey	Scott
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Serrano
Franks (CT)	Matsui	Shaw
Frost	Mazzoli	Shuster
Gallo	McCloskey	Sisk
Gejdenson	McCollum	Skeen
Gillmor	McCrery	Slaughter
Gilman	McDade	Smith (IA)
Gingrich	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gonzalez	McMillan	Smith (OR)
Goodling	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Goss	Meek	Solomon
Grams	Menendez	Spence
Grandy	Michel	Stearns
Greenwood	Mineta	Swift
Gunderson	Moakley	Taylor (NC)
Hall (OH)	Molinari	Tejeda
Hansen	Mollohan	Thomas (CA)
Hartman	Montgomery	Thomas (WY)
Hastert	Moran	Thornton
Hefner	Morella	Torkildsen
Herger	Murtha	Trafiacant
Hilliard	Myers	Tucker
Hinchee	Nadler	Underwood (GU)
Hobson	Natcher	Unsoeld
Hochbrueckner	Oberstar	Upton
Hoekstra	Oliver	Valentine
Horn	Ortiz	Velazquez
Houghton	Orton	Visclosky
Hoyer	Owens	Vucanovich
Hughes	Oxley	Walsh
Hunter	Pallone	Washington
Hutto	Parker	Waters
Hyde	Pastor	Watt
Jefferson	Paxon	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Payne (NJ)	Weldon
Kanjorski	Pelosi	Whitten
Kennelly	Petri	Wilson
Kim	Pickett	Wise
King	Pickle	Wolf
Klein	Pombo	Wynn
Klink	Porter	Young (AK)
Knollenberg	Portman	Zeliff
Kopetski	Pryce (OH)	

NOT VOTING—18

Bevill	Henry	Romero-Barcelo
Coleman	Johnston	(PR)
Conyers	Kolbe	Sarpalius
Faleomavaega	Lehman	Thompson
(AS)	Murphy	Torres
Ford (TN)	Obey	Towns
Hastings	Packard	

□ 1402

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Messrs. ZELIFF, DREIER, MCHUGH, HERGER, and HALL of Ohio changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. McCANDLESS, SMITH of Michigan, BARCIA of Michigan, MFUME, and LEWIS of Georgia changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] and I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. YATES.

Mr. Chairman, the administration's budget request included construction funding for several fish hatcheries. It is my understanding that the Fish and Wildlife Service is currently reviewing its hatchery system and the committee decided to defer these funding requests until such time as that review is complete and a comprehensive hatchery policy is in place.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Jackson National Fish Hatchery in Wyoming has a spring pipeline that is in dire need of replacement. Spring water is supplied to the hatchery through a 34-year-old steel pipeline that is leaking along most of its length. The pipeline is buried along a hillside and through wetland areas that creates shifting and provides an unstable base for the pipeline. A primary focus of the Jackson hatchery program is to sustain healthy populations of Snake River cutthroat trout, a species of concern throughout its range, so that the species will not require listing under the Endangered Species Act. Should the pipeline fail, not only is the hatchery's entire fish production for 1 year in danger, but the adult broodstock for the Snake River cutthroat trout could be wiped out, a population that would take 7 years to replace.

This is a situation we are all very concerned about for obvious reasons. The committee report lists funding for emergency construction projects under the Fish and Wildlife Service at \$1 million. Is it the chairman's understanding that if the Fish and Wildlife Service deems the hatchery is at risk, the Service could utilize some of the emergency funding for the Jackson National Fish Hatchery?

Mr. YATES. Yes, the gentleman is correct. I would encourage the Fish and Wildlife Service to use the emergency funding for this purpose, as necessary.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his consideration.

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2520 and I thank Chairman YATES and the committee for their wise choices in this difficult year. One provision with which I am particularly pleased relates to the Book Cliffs area of Utah, a spectacular, little-known mountainous plateau with rugged, wilderness characteristics. The elevation is approximately 8,500 feet at the Book Cliffs Divide and 6,500 feet at the lower elevation, with precipitation at as much as 18 to 20 inches at the higher elevations. The north slopes give way

to deep, sharp canyons of sagebrush, browse, pinon/juniper, and riparian areas. The lower elevation has broad flats between the draws and canyons and produces forewing, serviceberry, mahogany, wheatgrass and pinon/juniper. The vast plateau is almost completely uninhabited and the huge public lands grazing allotments are controlled by only five ranches.

This year's land and water conservation fund includes an appropriation of \$2.45 million to the Bureau of Land Management intended to fund the acquisition of the S&H Ranch and part of the Cripple Cowboy, two privately owned ranches. These are riparian lands along Bitter Creek, Chipeta Canyon, Sweetwater Canyon, South Canyon, Main Canyon, Meadow Creek, and Willow Creek and includes Utah's only designated roadless area. The lands at the higher elevations will provide increased forage for a variety of wildlife and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources has already begun moose transplants. Bighorn sheep and bison were once found in the areas and will be reintroduced. Wildlife such as deer, black bear, mountain lion, raptors, and small mammals will once again become part of the landscape.

This effort to acquire and preserve the cultural and resource values of these ranches was a project of the Book Cliffs conservation initiative, a cooperative program between the Bureau of Land Management and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. I had the pleasure of voting as a Utah senator to support this acquisition. Several local and national conservation organizations, including the Nature Conservancy, the Rocky Mt. Elk Foundation, and the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep, are working together in the initiative and will provide additional funding. The Book Cliffs conservation initiative will result in increased and improved wildlife habitat on over 600,000 acres of public and private land. Because the lands acquired include vast contiguous tracts encompassing entire watersheds, the initiative will have the opportunity to create a model for ecosystem management.

Again, I commend the chairman for his hard work and thank him for his foresight in helping to preserve these priceless lands.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Along with expressing my appreciation for your work on this bill, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify that the National Appropriate Technology Assistance Service [NATAS] was funded in the fiscal year 1994 Department of Energy appropriation.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct. The administration requested \$1.4 million for fiscal year 1994 in its budget for energy conservation and our bill supports the NATAS program in full.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My understanding is that the NATAS program has been run successfully from its inception by the nonprofit organization, the National Center for Appropriate Technology [NCAT]. It is the chairman's intent that this program should be continued to be administered by NCAT to ensure continued quality?

□ 1410

Mr. YATES. To the extent that I can do so, I would be willing to say yes.

I am aware of NCAT's good work and strong program management and expect the NATAS program to be continued to be managed by NCAT as indicated in the budget submission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to thank the chairman. As the chairman is aware NCAT has demonstrated good innovation and solid technical support and has received special acknowledgment by consumers and industry alike.

Mr. Chairman, I thank him and his colleagues on the committee for their continued support.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DUNCAN: Page 15, line 7, strike "\$1,059,333,000" and insert "\$1,045,333,000".

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill, as it presently stands, has a 122-percent increase in funding for the Presidio in San Francisco.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment and amendments thereto may close after 20 minutes on each side, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], and 20 minutes to be controlled by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as it presently stands, has a 122-percent increase in funding for the Presidio in San Francisco.

The bill increases funding from \$11.4 million this year to \$25.4 million this coming year.

My amendment is a simple freeze of this funding. It would save \$14 million. This amendment is supported and has been endorsed by the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the Citizens Against Government Waste.

This amendment would save the taxpayers \$14 million.

The GAO estimates a one-time cost of between \$850 million and \$1.2 billion to convert this base from a military base to a National Park.

After that, the Presidio will cost at least \$45 million a year to operate, three times as much as the Yellowstone National Park and five times as much as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

This park will be the most expensive national park in the country. It will drain money from every other park in the Nation.

All of this to create a park out of a base that now contains a pet cemetery, a bowling alley, a movie theater, and 1,200 units of 1950's-style housing.

In 1970, the Park Service professional staff specifically recommended that the major developed portions of the Presidio not be transferred to National Park Service jurisdiction.

The original bill recommended that only the coastal and historic areas be made a park.

This would require only about one-third of the acreage now being covered in this bill. The GAO has told us that \$49.3 million has already been allocated in the Department of Defense Budget to spend on improvements at the Presidio.

Mr. Chairman, over the last 2 years, Congress has appropriated \$15.4 million to the National Park Service for activities at the Presidio. Although the original schedule of the Park Service provided for the agency to develop a final plan for the Presidio in 1993, they have yet to even release a draft plan for public review.

Yet, the budget request by the administration, and this bill before us today, would allocate an additional \$25.4 million to the National Park Service for Presidio programs in fiscal year 1994. This bill seeks approval of the Congress to blindly go along with funding for this project, a project which is destined to be the most expensive park in the National Park System. I would like to provide my colleagues with a little history of this project.

The idea of turning the Presidio into a park originated in a single obscure sentence in the 1972 legislation establishing Golden Gate national recreation area in San Francisco. This sentence simply stated that if the Army ever determined that the Presidio was surplus to their needs, jurisdiction over the area would be turned over to the National Park Service.

Since there were no plans for the Army to leave in the foreseeable future, this provision was not extensively debated. However, the House report accompanying that bill made it clear that Congress did not believe the National Park Service should take over the entire Presidio. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that Congress fully

review this issue before allocating millions of scarce dollars.

The Presidio has a long history of military service and it has numerous historic buildings and natural resource areas which should be preserved. But the Presidio also has such facilities as huge hospitals, a bowling alley, a golf course, over 1,200 housing units, a medical research lab, a church, a supermarket, warehouses, a pet cemetery, and numerous other buildings and facilities.

In all, there are over 6 million square feet of building space within the Presidio. These buildings and facilities are not needed for any park purpose, nor is the Park Service, or even the Federal Government, best suited for their management.

Recently, the Base Closure Commission recommended that the 6th Army should continue to use the Presidio as its headquarters. However, that will provide for continued Federal occupation of less than 10 percent of the building space at the Presidio.

Unfortunately, like many of our Federal facilities around the country, the Presidio has not been adequately maintained by the Defense Department and is in need of massive amounts of funding for rehabilitation.

The current estimates are that about \$77 million is needed for initial toxic waste cleanup—excluding lead paint and asbestos removal—\$93 million is needed for infrastructure repair and somewhere between \$678 million and \$1 billion is needed to rehabilitate the 870 buildings.

In all, the total cost to rehabilitate this park is projected by the GAO to be somewhere between \$850 million to \$1.2 billion. Of course, toxic waste cleanup is a necessary Government expense, but the other 93 percent of the costs need not be Government expenses, unless the Government proposes to permanently occupy the entire area.

I must also add that just last year, the National Park Service estimated that rehabilitation of the buildings would cost somewhere between \$110 and \$325 million, so one can only wonder how high actual costs will really soar.

This one-time billion dollar cost for fixing up the Presidio is just the beginning. After initial startup costs comes the permanent cost of operating the park. The Park Service and Army have jointly estimated that the average cost of operating the Presidio over the last 5 years has been about \$45 million.

Even if costs of operating the Presidio as a park are no higher, this will still be the most expensive park to operate in the country by far; about 3 times the annual cost of operating Yosemite National Park.

In light of our Federal budget problems, imagine the outrage of hard-working Americans if they learned that a military base we are closing in San Francisco, in order to save taxpayer money, is going to actually cost

the taxpayers over \$1 billion to convert into a national park.

The Park Service is proposing a not too novel concept to reduce the burden to the Federal Government of operating this project. Since the National Park Service readily agrees that the building space is far in excess of any conceivable future agency needs, they want to just become landlords and lease it out.

The problem is that just 15 months before the National Park Service is scheduled to take over, they have just one tenant. I should not fail to mention that the Park Service is currently reviewing all sorts of imaginative proposals from such groups as the Pickle Family Circus and bungee jumping groups to name a few.

The preliminary National Park Service plan also includes such concepts as tearing down hospitals and destroying quality housing in a city where affordable housing is virtually nonexistent. These proposals are neither logical or economically justifiable.

It is my opinion that the Federal Government does not make a very good landlord. And, as is obvious from the underwhelming response to the Park Service's call for interested tenants, there is no great interest on behalf of the private sector to come in and invest hundreds of millions of dollars in Government facilities, which the Government will turn around and rent back to them at fair market value.

Perhaps some of my colleagues who have been here longer than I will remember what happened when the Park Service was identified as the agency to take over and run Union Station as the National Visitor Center. Despite pouring tens of millions of Federal dollars into that project over a 13-year period, the building came very close to succumbing to the wrecker's ball, leaking roof and all—until Congress passed legislation turning the building over to the private sector to rehabilitate and operate.

Well, the Presidio is the complexity of Union Station times 1,000. It is far beyond the capability of the National Park Service to operate, as their progress to date amply illustrates.

In my opinion, the best solution to this situation is for the Federal Government to retain only those Presidio lands which truly meet the high standards we have set for inclusion in the park system, and to divest itself of the remainder of the lands and facilities to the benefit of the Federal taxpayer, the U.S. Treasury, and the city of San Francisco.

We must not ignore options for non-Federal management of this site, because of a single sentence enacted over 20 years ago. However, I recognize that we will probably not debate the merits of such authorizing legislation here today.

What we must instead debate today is the merits of whether we should con-

cede to the administration proposal to spend \$25.4 million, which the administration presents as half the annual future cost of operating the Presidio as a national park, before there is any agreed upon plan.

My friends, buying into this proposal is the beginning of a tumble down a long slippery slope. I think that we must avoid committing huge amounts of additional Federal dollars to this project until we have a better idea of its total magnitude.

I believe that this project is one which we cannot afford, at a time when we are shutting down military bases all over the country to save taxpayer dollars and at a time when the existing park system is so underfunded and understaffed that visitors and resources are suffering.

I ask my colleagues who have a national park in your district if that park is adequately funded today, and I ask you to think what a billion dollar liability would do to your ability to secure the funds needed to fully operate those existing parks.

Today, the National Park Service faces a backlog of several billion dollars in land acquisition, about \$400 million in annual park operations, and billions of dollars in construction. All these high priority needs at existing parks will be pushed aside in an effort to meet the needs at the Presidio.

Proposals to provide adequate employee housing, fix park roads, protect park resources from vandals, search for lost visitors, provide adequate interpretation, and save historic buildings around the country will be impacted by this project. It is not acceptable to me to take precious funds from the operation of Yosemite, Yellowstone, or other National Park System areas to operate a bowling alley or golf course at the Presidio.

I know that each year, members of the Interior appropriation committee work very hard to meet all the requests of members, and I cannot imagine how much harder their jobs will be if we allow this billion dollar project to march forward.

I want to also point out to members, as I said earlier, that the bill which provided for Park Service takeover of the Presidio also established Golden Gate National Park. It is important to recognize that the Federal Government already owns extensive park lands within the city of San Francisco and surrounding counties.

The 73,000-acre Golden Gate National Recreation Area, which was established in 1972, will continue to provide recreation opportunities to millions of people at an annual operation cost of over \$10 million in 1994. In fact, the entire Presidio could still be developed as parkland, it is just that the total cost should not be underwritten by the Federal Government, as is currently envisioned.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this simple freeze amendment, and I suggest we hold the line on spending at this site until we have a better idea of where we are going.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to correct several statements the gentleman made.

The gentleman said that this funding was not authorized. It is authorized, Mr. Chairman. It is authorized by the basic legislation creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

The gentleman was correct in citing the law which says that at such time as the Department of Defense indicated that it had decided to turn over the Presidio, to surrender it for civilian use, it would become a national park. That is now the law.

All that the Committee on Appropriations seeks to do at this time, Mr. Chairman, is to provide caretaker funds. We are not enhancing the park. We are not embellishing its facilities.

This is an area that is one of the most beautiful in the entire United States, overlooking the Pacific Ocean. The real estate industry would dream about taking this over for subdivision.

We, the Army, the Department of the Interior, the administration, those who are responsible for deciding what to do with the Presidio, have not yet made a decision, and I think that we have to preserve the grounds. We have to preserve the resource qualities of the unit. We have to do those things which will not permit it to diminish in value. That is the reason we have put this money in.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the Presidio is a beautiful piece of property, as anybody knows who has visited it. My point is we simply cannot afford it. It is not worth borrowing more money so that we can add a new park like this to the national system.

We have had testimony, and the evidence is clear and indisputable, the National Park Service has had a 50-percent increase in operating and maintenance funds over the last 5 years. What business do we know of that can lay claim to that kind of an increase?

The tragedy is that once we go forward with this, as you can see from this chart, the annual costs of maintenance and operating the Presidio are going to be at about \$45 million per year.

□ 1420

It is going to be 2½ times as expensive to operate and maintain the Presidio as Yellowstone Park. Now, when

we are closing campgrounds within the existing parks right now and limiting the use of facilities ostensibly because we do not have enough money, I cannot see why we would want to go forward with this project when the bay area already has so many high-quality recreational areas, other facilities that can be used.

If we are serious about reducing the deficit, we ought to take one of the first steps right here and vote for the Duncan amendment. This is a responsible amendment.

We are not saying the Presidio is a bad project; we just cannot afford it. At a time when we are proposing to hike the tax on Social Security benefits from 50 to 85 percent, levy an energy tax, and dramatically increase the taxes on small businesses and individuals, we should not be continuing to squander public money in this fashion.

I would ask your support for the Duncan amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the law now says that it shall be a national park. Inasmuch as the law now says that, we have to take care of it as a national park.

The amount of money that we, the Committee on Appropriations, put into this bill is money that must be maintained until such time as the legislative committee decides whether it will remain a park or whether it is too expensive to maintain as a park, as the gentleman asserts. Perhaps that is the case. But I can see no choice at the present time except to preserve this very valuable property.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in the original legislation dealing with this—I have the actual language here right in front of me—it says:

Altogether, the Presidio of San Francisco totals about 1,400 acres of land. Under the terms of H.R. 16444, only 494 acres would be converted to recreation uses.

The original bill on this in 1970 specifically stated in the report accompanying that bill that not the entire Presidio would be converted into a park. That was never the intention of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, here is an example of how we drifted into a situation that is going to create large problems in the future. It has been pointed out there is no management plan; it has been point-

ed out this is going to cost \$45 to \$50 million a year to operate once it is taken over. I think for the Defense Department, with a budget of \$240 billion, to dump this onto the Park Service, with a budget of \$1 billion, does not make any sense as a national policy.

There are 870 buildings in this facility; what do we do with them? There are contaminants. This will be a Superfund site, probably, before it gets done.

The total Park Service operating budget, is only \$1 billion. Yet it is estimated that just to rehab the buildings will cost \$1 billion.

The point I want to make today is that we need to stop and decide whether that one sentence that pushed the Presidio into park development was a correct national policy. If we simply continue to fund this year after year, the problem will grow. I think now is the time to step back and say, "Does this make sense for the Park Service to become responsible for 870 buildings?"

Certainly there are many environmental values there including natural habitat that would be a wonderful addition to Golden Gate. But let us address that and separate out the buildings, let us separate out the problems that are being handed to the Park Service by the Defense Department in this action.

I think it was a bad policy initially. Let us not add to that bad policy by simply putting money in. Fund it at last year's level, \$11 million, save \$14 million and let us get the plan that has been in the works for about 3 years finished.

What is the proper policy, given the fact that we have 367 parks and museums, and so on, that need to share the \$1 billion annual operating budget for the Park Service? To put such a large share of that funding into one unit simply does not make good policy. There must be a better way, and we need to address it at this time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished congresswoman from San Francisco, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman and members of the committee who crafted such a balanced Interior appropriations bill that addresses the important natural resource needs of our Nation and offers us a good road map on the difficult journey to protect our national parks, rivers, wilderness areas, as well as programs important to the arts and other cultural and historical resources. Chairman YATES, ranking minority member MCDADE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. REGULA, and all the other members and staff who worked diligently on this measure deserve our appreciation. Again I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, obviously, in opposition to the amendment of the

gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

The Presidio project is an authorized project which has already received congressional funding and is in the advanced stages of development as a national park.

Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps one of the most exciting base closure conversions projects in the country. You will recall a few years ago Congresswoman BOXER and I came before this body and beseeched the House of Representatives to resist closing the Presidio because it had a 200-year history in our community, the Army did, and we thought it would cost the taxpayers money to convert that into something other than an Army base.

The Presidio plan that we are working on now, we hope, will be, as I said, a model. It will be a source of jobs, it will preserve the beauty of the Presidio and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and it will, yes, indeed, it will produce revenue to help reduce the deficit.

The Presidio plan will be available in September, I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA]. I am sure he is looking forward to the plan, which is not here. It will outline future uses of the park and the many ways to mitigate the cost to the Federal Government.

Every effort is being made to maximize revenues to the park and minimize the impact on the Federal Treasury. The Presidio has been a military installation since the Declaration of Independence was signed. Now, it represents a remarkable model for Defense conversion where swords can really be turned into plowshares. After over 200 years of military control, we can now march into the future knowing we have made our best attempt to preserve the important history of the Presidio and its unique natural resources for the generations to follow.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area, of which the Presidio will become a part, is the most visited park in the national system.

I urge my colleagues to listen to this: It is an international treasure, and almost 20 million people—some years it is 20 million, other years it is more than 20 million, some years it is fewer than 20 million people—visit each year from throughout the United States and around the world.

That is, please listen, three times as many visitors to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area than visit Yosemite and Grand Canyon combined each year.

Given the importance of the Presidio as a natural resource, a historic treasure and a place of beauty for the enjoyment of all Americans—and the fact that the Park Service will soon release documents containing facts critical to any discussion of the future of the base as a park—it would be irresponsible to

act today in this very capricious manner that could jeopardize the viability of this important public resource.

I believe we can look forward to an exemplary national park that will continue to benefit millions of worldwide visitors, bringing revenues to our park and that many generations will walk its paths after us.

Mr. Chairman, our colleagues, Chairman VENTO, Chairman MILLER, Chairman DELLUMS, and Chairman MURTHA, Chairs of the committees of jurisdiction governing the agreement between the Army and the Park Service, sent a "Dear Colleague" on this subject, and I would just like to read a little bit from the "Dear Colleague."

There they said:

The Presidio of San Francisco, one of the most beautiful and historic military bases in the Nation, will become a national park in 1994. Its conversion marks an unprecedented opportunity to reshape a natural and human-made resource into a world-class urban park and a global center for solutions to problems of the natural and human environments.

Under the 1988 Base Realignment and Closure Act enacted by Congress, 86 military installations in the United States were mandated for closure or realignment. Only the Presidio will remain under Government management as part of the national park system. Because of the efforts of former Congressman Phillip Burton, the Presidio will become part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the largest urban park in the world and the most heavily visited park in the country.

The Presidio represents a perfect example of how swords can be turned into plowshares.

□ 1430

I repeat for my colleagues' information:

Three times as many people visit the GGNRA as visit Yosemite and Grand Canyon National Parks combined this year.

This fall the Park Service will release their plan.

Over 400 organizations have responded to calls for interest that sought expression of interest from potential tenant institutions.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] was on the floor earlier and I thanked the gentleman because the Base Closure Commission this time gave us the Army as a tenant for a few more years to come.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I close my remarks by asking my colleagues to vote no, no, no on the Duncan amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out that nothing in my amendment would prohibit turning the coastal areas and the historic areas of the Presidio into a national park, but the pet cemetery, the bowling alley, the movie theater, the 1,200 acres of 1950-style housing, some of that does not belong in a national park.

In addition, the leases that are mentioned, 15 months before departure by

the Department of Defense there is only one non-Federal tenant that has leased any space there so far.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, for yielding me this time.

I just want to ask my colleague. Also does not the Presidio consist of golf courses, warehouses, and supermarkets, too?

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in behalf of Mr. DUNCAN's amendment to freeze the funding for the Presidio. Last year the National Park Service was appropriated \$11.4 million to run the areas of the Presidio which fall under its jurisdiction. This year the amount was increased to \$25.4 million to care for the base.

It is my understanding that, at this time, there is no final plan for utilization of these buildings. To my knowledge, the Park Service has four proposals which range in cost from \$850 million to \$1.2 billion for transforming these buildings into park facilities. I believe we need take a step back and determine what the best utilization will be of the existing facilities before we fund a program for their transition.

In the bill, \$25.4 million is appropriated for maintenance of the areas previously under jurisdiction of the Park Service and for the areas to be under the Park Service's jurisdiction in the future. By freezing this funding we save \$14 million, and there is still enough for maintenance.

There are many other national parks and forests, who have been waiting years for a couple million dollars for construction and renovation projects, which have not been granted funding this year because of budgetary constraints. Yet, this bill includes funding for a plan that has not been developed. The Army will be departing the Presidio in 14 months. Why not wait until then—when we have a better idea of what we will be funding.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would reject the Duncan amendment to cut the funding for the planning and maintenance of the Presidio.

As has already been stated in this debate, we are talking about a world-class urban park, national park, a park that has garnered more interest internationally than any other park that we have. Its visitors days exceed anything we have seen in any other of our national parks.

As the critics of this program quite correctly point out, we do not have a

plan in place yet. The plan is dealing with the development of that park. They suggest that we will be running supermarkets and fire stations and items such as that. We do not know that.

We know that the planning process, and Congresswoman PELOSI and myself and others have talked to the National Park Service and explained to them that this must maintain and include the attributes and the assets and the values that we place in national parks as they develop that plan.

We will have to see what happens to all the buildings and all the real estate.

But let me explain to you. This may be one of the more successful efforts we have ever had in economic conversion from a military base to civilian use.

Across the bay in my district, this Congress is going to spend over a billion dollars to do nothing more than close the facility, without any understanding or any plan or even any thought about how it will be used in the future.

Many of the costs that are attributed to the Presidio are there whether it was a park or it was simply a closed facility.

We have requests from people who want to be rent-paying tenants, international organizations of international significance that want to contribute to the participation and the support of the Presidio, and at the same time we are able to maintain one of the great urban resources in this entire country.

This amendment does nothing more than make this process more expensive. This amendment does nothing more than interrupt an ongoing planning process so we can start to decide what it is the taxpayers of this country should start to pay for and what it is that others will have to pay for if they want to maintain those facilities or real estate that does affect the programs and the assets and the value of the National Park System.

So I want say to my colleagues that this is a very unwise amendment. We had a quick look at this amendment, this proposal, in the Committee on Natural Resources and we rejected it. We rejected it out of hand.

When the Park Service comes forward with that plan, it is the intent of the Committee on Natural Resources to hold hearings on that proposal, to make sure that we protect both the values of this park and we protect the taxpayers who will be expected to fund that share of it.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we would vote "no" on the Duncan amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Duncan amendment.

The Duncan amendment and the proponents of this would try and turn the

clock back. The fact is that the Golden Gate National Recreation Area which has been derived from the Presidio almost in its entirety, most of this land was national military land, and wisely a policy was put forth that provided when and if the military withdrew, and/or they found less use for some of these important lands, it would go into a public recreational area and for other values related to this park unit.

And why? Because many of the features of the Presidio are outstanding. It contains federally and State-listed rare, threatened, and endangered plant and animal species.

The Presidio represents 228 years of land use and occupation by three nations as a permanent military garrison.

The Presidio's military architecture even today contains styles that span every period of military history from 1848.

The Presidio has been a logistical center for every military engagement since the Mexican-American war.

The Presidio is a place of unique scenic quality and contains a broad range of recreational activities within a major metropolitan area.

It is simply the most visited park unit in the Nation, with over 20 million visits.

The point is that whether we want to spend this money or not, if the Park Service does not spend it, then another pocket of the national government, the military must.

As a matter of fact, many of the expenses that they are maintaining in terms of cleanup and other expenses are expenses that legitimately must be borne by the military under the present policy path.

To cut this funding today simply is to try to turn back history. This will prevent the Park Service from moving ahead with its plan, from trying to implement the adaptive leasing and the other types of innovation that are necessary to fulfill the role envisioned under law and necessary to be performed by the National Government.

We stand ready and prepared to deal with the special problems that are presented with the assessment of the park unit by the planning process now in place, but the NPS cannot do what must be done if we don't move forward with the plan, and that is what this amendment frustrates, so I urge defeat of the amendment. It is a major retreat from facing problems at the GGNRA/Presidio.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Duncan amendment.

I can remember very well when Congressman Phil Burton of California passed this legislation. Part of the legislation was that at some future date if the base was closed down that significant parts of it, or I guess all of it,

would be transferred to the Park Service.

□ 1440

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask a question of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Is there a plan that is being developed about what will be, in fact, transferred to the Park Service, or has that been accomplished?

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, working on a plan for several years. There are several problems with some of the buildings and facilities. Some of them may well be retained by the military, but that is evolving. None of the money here is expended on buildings that are inappropriate. We are looking for activities that would be appropriate, like the adaptive leasing under the Historic Preservation Act, and, as the gentleman has pointed out, the hope is that much of the expense of this park could be offset by such long-term leasing. We may need to rewrite some of the leasing laws to facilitate the unique problems presented by this transfer of land and buildings.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I have been out to the site twice, and I think it is one of the great treasures of our country, and this notion that we can only have a park in a rural area I think is a mistake. We have urban parks all over the United States, and this particular site is probably one of the most striking that any individual will ever see. Congressman Burton did, I think, a brilliant job in setting this thing aside and having a great vision, and I think the numbers, like 88.5 million people, went to that park last year. I mean that is unbelievable, and I know that obviously it is expensive, and we are worried about being able to take care of our—20 million; I am corrected here properly, 20 million people went.

I mean we need parks in urban areas. Not everybody is financially capable in this society of ours, especially with the standard of living dropping, of going out to Yosemite, so I would urge opposition to the Duncan amendment. Let us support this and work with the committee to make the best possible judgment about the future.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], who spoke earlier and who has also been to the site.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we have no disagreement with the park portions. The park land is beautiful. I have been to the Presidio. I have been to Golden Gate. Both are terrific assets.

The problem is 870 buildings that are going to become a burden for the park

service. The problem is the contaminated areas, and, when we are faced with rationing in Yosemite, when we are faced with closing down facilities, or restricting hours, to take this amount of money to save the defense budget does not make any sense. This is a Defense Department problem, and it, therefore, should be paying for this.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concern about any contamination by the military. This is not an uncommon problem with military withdrawals across the country.

Mr. REGULA. That is why the park department should not be paying the bill.

Mr. VENTO. I agree, but the dollars that are being cut here are not going for the cleanup purpose. They are going for the adaptive leasing and management of the park unit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, I regret that this debate did not take place some years ago. I think we backed into this one, and it was put in there in an overnight fashion. We should have been debating all of these policy issues. But, nevertheless, at some point, we have to step back and say, "Given the obligations that the chairman, and I, and the members of the subcommittee have to 367 parks, is this going to cripple our ability to meet needs in other areas?" That is the reason why I support this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The Defense Department has committed itself to pay \$62 million for the cleanup that the gentleman referred to.

Mr. REGULA. But we have no idea what the total cost will be. We are talking about a potential \$1 billion to deal with the contamination and rehabbing the buildings.

Mr. YATES. Well, the gentleman and I, I think, are together on what we want to do. We do not want to have an overexpenditure, but we have put into this bill, the gentleman and I, the amount of money that was requested by the Park Service—

Mr. REGULA. I understand.

Mr. YATES. Purely for caretaking, and I cannot escape the conclusion that, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee were to prevail, we are going to cripple the activities of the Park Service in taking care of this very valuable property, and I

know the gentleman would not want that.

Mr. REGULA. I appreciate the value of the park portion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CLEMENT). The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has expired.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], another member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN]. Today I think we have the opportunity to do what the people have been saying for several months, and that is, cut spending first. They recognize it is going to mean sacrifice in some areas. They recognize that it is not going to be pleasant to all parts of the country, but they are saying it is needed and that it must be done now.

The question comes to their minds, I am sure, as to why, as the gentleman from Tennessee pointed out, we are taking on a pet cemetery, hospitals, medical research labs, bowling alleys, churches, and other facilities that have nothing to do with national parks, but the cost of that also is a question. Now the GAO estimates the cleanup at somewhere between \$1 and \$1.2 billion, not to mention the additional funds that we have.

I would like to point out that the leases that we have been talking about, one has applied, several have inquired. The Pickle Family Circus School has inquired about a lease, the Golden Gate bungee tower, the frisbee golf course, the surf condition hot line, and the Institutes for Public Golf. Those may be perfectly legitimate uses for this land, but not to be paid for by the people, the taxpayers in this area, at a time when we need to cut spending.

I will tell my colleagues that in the Smokies right now, on the North Carolina side, taking up 85 percent of those counties unemployment runs 20 to 25 percent, and we cannot get a few million dollars to open a heritage center, or to do road work, or to take care of overworked camp areas where people have to wait in line to get into those, and we are talking about putting hundreds, hundreds of millions of dollars in a new facility.

Mr. Chairman, it is not right. It is not what the people of this country want. I hope my colleagues will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, to close our debate on our side, I yield my re-

maining 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] for yielding this time to me, and I would just like to say that here is a classic example of how things get out of control. We misprioritize spending around this place, and here we are talking about spending \$1.2 billion on a new park when right next door there is a 74,000-acre park, and the park department is only spending \$10 million a year on that one, and they want to put \$25 million or so, \$25.4 million, into this this year. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] wants to cut that by \$14 million, thus leaving \$11.4 million for this particular facility. That is still more than the Golden Gate Park which is only getting \$10 million.

And what is this going to do? Without further study, without completely studying this issue and this project, we are going to be spending ultimately \$1.2 billion for hazardous waste clean-up, and we do not know how severe that is going to be.

Infrastructure rehabilitation, personal property replacement, building rehabilitation, two hospitals, a golf course, a bowling alley, pet cemetery; give me a break. The gentleman from California said that there was going to be a lot of receipts coming in from this, and many people would be led to believe by that remark that that would help pay off the cost of this \$1.2 billion.

There is an old song by Zager and Evans that said, "In the year 2525, if man is still alive." Well, maybe in that length of time we would have enough receipts from this project for it to pay for itself.

□ 1450

But the fact of the matter is, we are not going to live that long, and if we keep spending like this, the country will not live that long. We have got a \$4.3 trillion debt, skyrocketing towards \$7 trillion. The interest alone is going to be one of the biggest expenditures in our budget. We must prioritize spending. This issue must be studied fully before we appropriate this kind of money for this.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of my colleagues, if they are really concerned about fiscal responsibility, if they are really concerned about what President Clinton promised, getting control of spending, they ought to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] to cut this back to \$11.4 million. It is the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do at this time, because this economy is on the road to disaster if we do not get control of spending and do not start prioritizing around this place.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said that he wanted a break. Rather than giving him a break, we will give him the truth about his figures.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, a "Dear Colleague" distributed by our friends advancing this amendment has figures and representations that are inaccurate. They attribute the figures to the GAO.

The GAO has provided no cost estimate as to what the total costs for the Presidio transfer would be.

Mr. Chairman, they suggested in their "Dear Colleague" that such dollar numbers are \$850 million to \$1.2 billion. These are not GAO figures. So I challenge the gentleman not to use or refer to this in terms of their debate here, nor Members to consider it valid with regard to making a judgment today.

What is in this bill and what is at the heart of this amendment is cutting out building maintenance repair of \$9 million; \$1.8 million in police and fire; utilities, concessions, business management, some \$14 million.

The truth is the NPS need those dollars to shift the ownership and implement the plan and to accomplish and implement a rational program of management. The military would have many expenses no matter what occurs here today. Hopefully, Congress will not let them walk away from the toxic and other problems that they should resolve. This Member and others will fight to be certain that these obligations are met.

But the citizens in this community are looking to have this become part of the park. There is no other place or entity prepared to take over this area. We made the decision on closing the base. Now we have to step up and do the job with regards to the remainder of the law that exists and complete the policy and meet our responsibilities. Vote "no" on the Duncan amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CLEMENT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, yeas 230, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

AYES—193

Allard	Goodling	Parker
Andrews (NJ)	Goss	Paxon
Applegate	Grams	Penny
Archer	Grandy	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Greenwood	Petri
Bacchus (AL)	Gunderson	Pombo
Baker (LA)	Hall (TX)	Porter
Ballenger	Hancock	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Poshard
Bartlett	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hayes	Quillen
Bentley	Hefley	Quinn
Bilirakis	Herger	Ramstad
Bliley	Hobson	Ravenel
Blute	Hoekstra	Regula
Boehlert	Hoke	Ridge
Boehner	Holden	Roberts
Bonilla	Houghton	Rogers
Brewster	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hutto	Roth
Buyer	Hyde	Roukema
Callahan	Inglis	Royce
Calvert	Inhofe	Santorum
Camp	Istook	Saxton
Canady	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Clement	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Kim	Shaw
Coble	King	Shays
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Shuster
Combest	Klug	Skeen
Cooper	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Costello	Kyl	Smith (NJ)
Cox	Laughlin	Smith (OR)
Cramer	Lazio	Smith (TX)
Crane	Levy	Snowe
Crapo	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Cunningham	Lightfoot	Spence
Danner	Linder	Stearns
DeLay	Lipinski	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Stump
Dickey	Machtey	Sundquist
Doolittle	Mann	Talent
Dornan	Manzullo	Tanner
Dreier	McCandless	Tauzin
Duncan	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	McHugh	Thomas (CA)
English (OK)	McInnis	Thomas (WY)
Everett	McKeon	Torkildsen
Ewing	Menendez	Upton
Fawell	Meyers	Valentine
Fields (TX)	Mica	Volkmer
Fowler	Michel	Vucanovich
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Walker
Franks (NJ)	Mollinari	Walsh
Gallegly	Moorhead	Weldon
Gallo	Murphy	Wolf
Gekas	Myers	Young (AK)
Geren	Neal (NC)	Young (FL)
Gilchrest	Nussle	Zeliff
Gillmor	Orton	Zimmer
Gingrich	Oxley	
Goodlatte	Pallone	

NOES—230

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	Dicks
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	Dingell
Andrews (ME)	Bryant	Dixon
Andrews (TX)	Byrne	Dooley
Bacchus (FL)	Cantwell	Durbin
Baerles	Cardin	Edwards (CA)
Baker (CA)	Carr	Edwards (TX)
Barca	Chapman	Engel
Barcia	Clay	English (AZ)
Barlow	Clayton	Eshoo
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Evans
Bateman	Collins (IL)	Farr
Becerra	Collins (MI)	Fazio
Beilenson	Condit	Fields (LA)
Bereuter	Coppersmith	Filner
Berman	Coyne	Fingerhut
Bilbray	Darden	Flake
Bishop	de la Garza	Foglietta
Blackwell	de Lugo (VI)	Ford (MI)
Bonior	Deal	Frank (MA)
Borski	DeFazio	Frost
Boucher	DeLauro	Furse
Brooks	Dellums	Gedensson
Browder	Derrick	Gephardt
Brown (CA)	Deutch	Gibbons

Gilman	Martinez	Sabo
Glickman	Matsui	Sanders
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Sangmeister
Gordon	McCloskey	Sawyer
Green	McCurdy	Schenk
Gutierrez	McDade	Schroeder
Hall (OH)	McDermott	Schumer
Hamburg	McHale	Scott
Hamilton	McKinney	Serrano
Harman	McMillan	Sharp
Hefner	McNulty	Shepherd
Hilliard	Meehan	Sisisky
Hinches	Meek	Skaggs
Hoagland	Mfume	Skelton
Hochbrueckner	Miller (CA)	Slattery
Horn	Mineta	Slaughter
Hoyer	Minge	Smith (IA)
Huffington	Mink	Spratt
Hughes	Moakley	Stark
Inlee	Mollohan	Stokes
Jacobs	Montgomery	Strickland
Jefferson	Moran	Studds
Johnson (GA)	Morella	Stupak
Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Swett
Johnson, E.B.	Nadler	Swift
Johnston	Natcher	Synar
Kanjorski	Neal (MA)	Tejeda
Kaptur	Norton (DC)	Thompson
Kennedy	Oberstar	Thornton
Kennelly	Obey	Thurman
Kildee	Olver	Torricelli
Kleczka	Ortiz	Trafficant
Klein	Owens	Tucker
Klink	Pastor	Underwood (GU)
Kopetski	Payne (NJ)	Unsoeld
Kreidler	Payne (VA)	Velazquez
LaFalce	Pelosi	Vento
Lambert	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky
Lancaster	Pickett	Washington
Lantos	Pomeroy	Waters
LaRocco	Price (NC)	Watt
Leach	Rahall	Waxman
Levin	Rangel	Wheat
Lewis (CA)	Reed	Whitten
Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Williams
Lloyd	Richardson	Wilson
Long	Roemer	Wise
Lowe	Romero-Barcelo	Woolsey
Maloney	(PR)	Wyden
Manton	Rose	Wynn
Margolles	Rostenkowski	Yates
Mezvisinsky	Rowland	
Markay	Roybal-Allard	

NOT VOTING—16

Bevill	Ford (TN)	Pickle
Coleman	Hastings	Rush
Conyers	Henry	Sarpalius
Faleomavaega	Kolbe	Torres
(AS)	Lehman	Towns
Fish	Packard	

□ 1511

Messrs. POMEROY, PAYNE of Virginia, and KENNEDY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KASICH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill reflects a new direction in the stewardship of our Nation's Federal lands and natural resources. The mismanagement of the past has undermined both healthy forest ecosystems, timber-dependent communities, salmon runs, and hydroelectric customers. Now, a new administration and a new management approach offers us an opportunity to sustain natural resources for both habitat and human needs. This bill marks an important transition point in this change.

Thanks to the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. YATES], my Washington State colleague, NORM DICKS, other members of the committee, and the indefatigable staff; this bill moves us into a new era of resource stewardship. While the full transition cannot take place overnight, the Interior appropriations bill reflects the restructuring of the national forest system under the administration's gridlock-breaking forest plan; it begins to shift the emphasis—from narrow, short term, profit-based resource management that led to the species-by-species crisis to a broader ecosystem management approach; it highlights the vital importance of watershed protection and restoration to ecosystem health if we are to have sustainable use of our resources; it boosts recreation as a management goal by calling for the conversion of old logging roads to recreational trails; and it helps provide good jobs in the same communities that have depended on our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, not everyone is happy or ready to accept the kinds of change advocated by the new administration and reflected in this bill. Those advocating more forest preservation, for example, attempted to reduce the Forest Service's road construction budget to further reduce timber harvests. But the House sent a message to these people when it rejected that amendment. The message was that we are prepared to work together with this administration to break through the court injunctions and bring back some stability and certainty to our timber-dependent communities. After 5 years of rhetorical debates in this body that produced nothing but false hopes, I see no acceptable alternatives.

This is not an easy process, but the committee has done a commendable job of balancing the need for change with the impact of change on affected communities. It has done this delicate balancing within tighter budget constraints than ever before. And I want to commend the committee for its progress toward this new era of resource stewardship.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his support of a project I call roads to trails and, in particular, for setting aside \$200,000 for a roads assessment in Washington's Gifford Pinchot National Forest.

Due to declining timber sales, many roads in our national forests no longer are needed. In most cases, these roads cannot simply be abandoned. They are affecting natural resources now, or will do so in the future, without costly regular maintenance. Sidecasting, slope, and culvert failures, slumping, and other problems cause siltation of streams and degradation of water quality. Removing roads requires planned reconstruction, including removing fill

slopes, bridges, and culverts, establishing original slope contours, and replanting road alignments with native vegetation.

Roads to trails conversion projects offer opportunities to expand recreation by converting the roads into trails rather than obliterating them. Such projects also could save money by eliminating maintenance costs on unneeded roads and preventing expenditures on rehabilitation of watersheds damaged by road failures in the future. In fact, it is cheaper to expand the trails network through roads-to-trails conversion than it is to construct new trails. The cost of constructing new trails in the Gifford Pinchot is, on average, three times greater than converting roads to trails.

Roads to trails projects also will provide employment opportunities for dislocated workers in timber communities—jobs in the forest. The public is demanding that we protect ancient forests and manage timber production for sustainable yield. Entire timber communities are affected by this change in policy, and we must assist them by supporting real jobs within the forest—as opposed to retraining programs in big cities hundreds of miles away.

H.R. 2520 sets aside \$200,000 from the Forest Service budget for the Gifford Pinchot National Forest to complete a comprehensive inventory and assessment of roads, to identify roads that should be scheduled for permanent closure or obliteration, and to determine which of those roads are suitable for conversion to recreational trails. The inventory should identify all roads that should be closed, abandoned, or obliterated for fisheries wildlife, watershed protection or recovery, ecosystem management, cultural resource protection, or fiscal reasons.

The Gifford Pinchot's inventory and assessment process should use effective public participation to identify roads to trails project proposals—including conversion standards and potential trail users. This inventory and assessment should identify potential roads to trails conversion areas which would expand recreational trails and help alleviate multiple use conflicts.

The process also should include comprehensive review and input by Forest Service and other agency resource specialists to ensure all resource concerns are identified. Through the advice of resource experts, the public and the Forest Service should be discouraged from investing energy in project proposals that have resource conflicts, such as trails for motorized vehicles in endangered species recovery areas.

The inventory and assessment on the Gifford Pinchot can be a model planning process for national forests across the country. In fact, while money is specifically earmarked for the Gifford Pinchot, the committee intends roads assessments to be conducted on all of

our national forests where roads are scheduled for permanent closure or removal. I am encouraged by the committee's foresight in supporting a creative forest management program to help restore natural resource areas, cut spending, create jobs, and enhance the quality of life for everyone who visits our national forests.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 15, line 23.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VENTO: On page 15 line 23, strike "\$35,606,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$34,838,000."

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, subsequent to preparing my amendment to delete funding for the National Institute on the Conservation of Cultural Property, I have had discussions with Chairman YATES regarding the use of these funds, and I believe this matter can be addressed to the satisfaction of both of us by a colloquy.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has consented to agree to such a colloquy. I would ask the gentleman, as I said, I am prepared to withdraw the amendment with the understanding and concurrence of the chairman, that any grant for such purpose be competitively awarded; that the National Park Service may decide to do this work internally if it so chooses, and that any grants be coordinated with other National Park Service activities, specifically with the Center for Preservation Technology and Training.

I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he agrees with my comments.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, that is my understanding of it, yes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, with that understanding and concurrence, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VENTO

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 15, line 7.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VENTO: On page 15, line 7, strike "\$1,059,333,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,059,033,000."

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, this simply deletes \$300 million earmarked for the committee report for an unauthorized project in New Jersey called the Coastal Heritage Trail Route.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, just to correct the gentleman, the correct amount is \$ 300,000, and we accept the amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the correction.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1520

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take a moment to highlight the significance of my point of order, which was sustained, against the original amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] on National Park Service construction. That amendment would have waived the provisions of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451) which state: "No expenditure for construction of administration or other buildings cost in case of any building exceeding \$3,000 shall be made in any national park except under express authority of Congress."

Consequently, that amendment would have preserved the Appropriations Committee's earmarked funding of nearly all of the \$49.84 million for 56 site-specific projects included in H.R. 2520 and the accompanying report (House Report 103-158, pages 29-33).

As a result of my point of order, the final bill language on National Park Service construction approves \$183,949,000 for all the Service's construction—including, regrettably, an additional \$2,000,000 for the Boston Public Library under the authority of the Historic Preservation Fund—subject to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 451. This has the effect of completely eliminating the other \$47.84 million in earmarked projects contained in H.R. 2520

and in House Report 103-158, because they are not expressly authorized and are obviously in excess of \$3,000.

I also want to point out that the inclusion of these earmarks resulted in the committee deleting \$51.591 million impacting 74 projects which the Park Service had proposed in its fiscal year 1994 construction budget. I particularly want to note that the committee cut nearly \$11 million for restoration of the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site in Atlanta, GA, and funding for many, many other worthy projects which had passed the scrutiny and procedures of the professionals in the National Park Service. A complete list of these earmarks and deletions, as well as Park Service comments on these projects are attached to my statement for the RECORD.

Unless the act is amended or unless waived in the Senate or in the conference committee on this bill, none of the funds contained in the Park Service's construction budget may be used "for construction of administration or other buildings cost in case of any building exceeding \$3,000 * * * in any national park except under express authority of Congress." We must, therefore, watch carefully to see to it that the act is not repealed and/or otherwise waived in the continuation of the appropriations process for this bill.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$184,699,000, a reduction of \$1,001,000 from the Administration's request of \$185,700,000, and a decrease of \$45,132,000 from the FY 1993 level of \$229,831,000. (House Report 103-158, pages 29-33; H.R. 2520, page 16 line 5 through page 17, line 3.)

The Committee recommends 57 specific increases totaling \$50,590,000, including 56 increases totaling \$49,840,000 as listed below.

1. *Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site, Pennsylvania*—Line Item Construction: \$1,930,000 increase to \$0 request for Lemon House rehabilitation. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Very low SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

2. *Boston National Historical Park, Massachusetts*—Line Item Construction: \$2,700,000 increase to \$0 request for Old South Meeting House. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

3. *Boston National Historical Park, Massachusetts*—Line Item Construction: \$700,000 increase to \$0 request for Dorchester Heights. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

4. *Boston Public Library, Massachusetts*—Line Item Construction: \$2,000,000 increase to \$0 request for rehabilitation. (House Report 103-158, page 30; H.R. 2520, page 16, lines 9-12.)

NPS: "The library is not affiliated with the NPS. However, as a National Historic Landmark, it could receive funds under the National Preservation Act. The estimated total cost for rehabilitation is expected to total \$50 million."

5. *Chamizal National Monument, Texas*—Line Item Construction: \$840,000 increase to \$0 request for landscape, lighting. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

6. *Chickamauga-Chattanooga National Military Park, Tennessee*—Line Item Construction: \$5,000,000 increase to \$0 request for road relocation. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Low SWP [Servicewide Priority]; additional work could be deferred".

7. *Coulee Dam National Recreational Area, Washington*—Line Item Construction: \$416,000 increase to \$0 request for boat launch. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Low SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

8. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreational Area, Ohio*—Line Item Construction: \$1,264,000 increase to \$0 request to rehabilitate historic structures. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

9. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreational Area, Ohio*—Line Item Construction: \$2,000,000 increase to \$0 request for railroad track and bridges: \$2,000,000. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

10. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreational Area, Ohio*—Line Item Construction: \$2,500,000 increase to \$0 request for Boston General Store. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred".

11. *Delaware Water Gap National Recreational Area, Pennsylvania*—Line Item Construction: \$195,000 increase to \$0 request for trail development. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Not part of overall rehabilitation project; should be deferred".

12. *Gateway National Recreational Area, New York*—Line Item Construction: \$5,200,000 increase to \$0 request for Jacob Riis Park. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Lower SWP [Servicewide Priority]; could be deferred".

13. *Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania*—Line Item Construction: \$100,000 increase to \$0 request for technical assistance: \$100,000. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; non-park related local support should be deferred".

14. *Glacier National Park, Montana*—Line Item Construction: \$600,000 increase to \$0 request to rehabilitate chalets. "A total of \$1,000,000 has been provided to bring National Historic Landmark chalets at Glacier National Park into compliance with Montana and Federal health and safety standards. In providing this appropriation the Committee expects the National Park Service to continue providing a valued visitor experience; to assure a safe, efficient, and cost effective operating plan; and to provide appropriate disposal systems that will ensure the long term capability of these facilities to operate in an environmentally responsible manner." (House Report 103-158, pages 30 and 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; should be deferred; \$200,000 would need to be used for planning".

15. *Great Basin National Park, Nevada*—Line Item Construction: \$250,000 increase to \$0 request for water system. "The general management plan for Great Basin National Park designates that administrative, maintenance, housing and visitor contact facilities be placed on the 80-acre administrative site adjacent to Baker, NV. These new facilities will require construction of adequate water and wastewater services. The new administrative site will hook into the joint National Park Service/Baker water and sewer system.

The Committee has provided \$250,000 to the Baker Water and Sewer General Improvement District to cover the additional cost for oversizing the system to serve Service facilities in addition to the community of Baker, NV." (House Report 103-158, pages 30 and 32, and H.R. 2520, page 16, line 24; page 17, line 3.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], amount is lower than current estimates, archeo work needed".

16. *Ice Age Scientific Reserve, Wisconsin*—Line Item Construction: \$500,000 increase to \$0 request for exhibits. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], non-NPS area should be deferred".

17. *Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Indiana*—Line Item Construction: \$125,000 increase to \$0 request for Long Lake Wetlands Overlook. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], non-safety/preservation issue should be deferred".

18. *James A. Garfield National Historic Site, Ohio*—Line Item Construction: \$1,311,000 increase to \$0 request for site, building restoration. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Additional phase of ongoing rehabilitation could be deferred".

19. *Jean Lafitte National Historical Park, Louisiana*—Line Item Construction: \$100,000 increase to \$0 request for Barataria levee recreation plan. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], non-safety/preservation issue should be deferred".

20. *Lackawanna Heritage Park, Pennsylvania*—Line Item Construction: \$670,000 increase to \$0 request for technical assistance. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; non-park related local support should be deferred".

21. *Lincoln Research Center, Illinois*—Line Item Construction: \$3,000,000 increase to \$0 request "for the Lincoln Center to be developed in Springfield, Illinois in conjunction with the Lincoln Home National Historic Site. The National Park Service should not use this money until the appropriate authorization is in place which sets out the overall scope of the project." (House Report 103-158, pages 30 and 32, and H.R. 2520, page 16, lines 15-18.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], not NPS area related, funds cannot be obligated in FY 1994".

22. *Lincoln Home National Historic Site, Illinois*—Line Item Construction: \$709,000 increase to \$0 request for Dubois House rehabilitation. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], structure not jeopardized, work could be deferred".

23. *Lincoln Home National Historic Site, Illinois*—Line Item Construction: \$707,000 increase to \$0 request for Morse House rehabilitation. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], structure not jeopardized, work could be deferred".

24. *Lyndon B. Johnson National Historic Site, Texas*—Line Item Construction: \$100,000 increase to \$1,300,000 request for exhibits. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Additional amounts for exhibits can be obligated".

25. *Mount Vernon Bicycle Trail, Virginia*—Line Item Construction: \$450,000 increase to \$0 request to correct safety hazards. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], work should be deferred".

26. *Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi*—Line Item Construction: \$4,000,000 increase to \$0 request for Parkway construction in addition to \$5,500,000 request in the Federal Lands Highway Program. (House Report 103-158, pages 30 and 31.)

NPS: "Additional phase could be deferred, ongoing work in progress".

27. *New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail, New Jersey*—Line Item Construction: \$255,000 increase to \$0 request for signage/interpretative plan. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], would develop interpretative plan, trails, exhibits".

28. *North Cascades National Park, Washington*—Line Item Construction: \$40,000 increase to \$0 request for Sterling Munro Nature Trail. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Service Priority], work more appropriately accomplished in ONPS [Operation of the National Park System] program".

29. *Port Chicago National Memorial, California*—Line Item Construction: \$40,000 increase to \$0 request for memorial fabrication/construction. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], not an NPS area, funds could be appropriated to the Navy".

30. *Salem Maritime National Historical Park, Massachusetts*—Line Item Construction: \$1,300,000 increase to \$0 request for various projects. \$1,300,000. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Additional Central Wharf exhibits, waysides, etc., should be deferred".

31. *San Antonio Missions National Historical Park, Texas*—Line Item Construction: \$1,406,000 increase to \$0 for exhibitions. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], exhibit work should be deferred".

32. *Stones River National Battlefield, Tennessee*—Line Item Construction: \$700,000 increase to \$0 for trail connector. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], non-safety/preservation work could be deferred".

33. *Thomas Stone National Historic Site, Maryland*—Line Item Construction: \$1,170,000 increase to \$0 for main house restoration. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], non-safety/preservation issue should be deferred".

34. *Ulysses S. Grant National Historic Site, Missouri*—Line Item Construction: \$150,000 increase to \$0 to restore historic structures. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], only planning work could be undertaken in FY 1994".

35. *Upper Susquehanna Heritage, Pennsylvania*—Line Item Construction: \$50,000 increase for technical assistance. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority]; non-park related local support should be deferred".

36. *War in the Pacific, Guam*—Line Item Construction: \$500,000 increase to \$0 request for monument. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

37. *Weir Farm National Historic Site, Connecticut*—Line Item Construction: \$395,000 increase to \$0 request to restore historic structures. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], next phase of work could be deferred".

38. *Yosemite National Park, California*—Line Item Construction: \$250,000 increase to \$0 request for Bearbox installation. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

39. *Boston National Historical Park, Massachusetts*—Planning: \$315,000 increase to \$0 request for Old South Meeting House. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

40. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, Ohio*—Planning: \$185,000 increase to \$0 request for riverbank stabilization. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

41. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, Ohio*—Planning: \$200,000 increase to \$0 request for railroad maintenance facility.

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

42. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, Ohio*—Planning: \$50,000 increase to \$0 request for Snowville and Dover reclamation: \$50,000. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

43. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, Ohio*—Planning: \$80,000 increase to \$0 request for Tinkers Creek Aqueduct. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

44. *Fort Necessity National Battlefield, Pennsylvania*—Planning: \$775,000 increase to \$0 request for Historic Structures Report; exhibit plans; archaeological research.

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

45. *Glacier National Park, Montana*—Planning: \$400,000 increase to \$0 request to rehabilitate chalets. "A total of \$1,000,000 has been provided to bring National Historic Landmark chalets at Glacier National Park into compliance with Montana and Federal health and safety standards. In providing this appropriation the Committee expects the National Park Service to continue providing a valued visitor experience; to assure a safe, efficient, and cost effective operating plan; and to provide appropriate disposal systems that will ensure the long term capability of these facilities to operate in an environmentally responsible manner." (House Report 103-158, pages 31 and 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred; would need \$200,000 more from line item to do".

46. *James A. Garfield National Historic Site, Ohio*—Planning: \$210,000 increase to \$0 request for site, building restoration. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

47. *Olympic National Park, Washington*—Planning: \$2,464,000 increase to \$336,000 request for Elwha Dam removal. "Funds provided to implement the Elwha River Ecosystem and Fisheries Restoration Act (P.L. 102-495) shall also allow for baseline studies to be conducted to consider potential impacts on water quality that would occur from the removal of the Elwha dams. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

48. *Thomas Stone National Historic Site, Maryland*—Planning: \$150,000 increase to \$0 request for main house restoration. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

49. *Zion National Park, Utah*—Planning: \$360,000 increase to \$0 request for transport system. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "No SWP [Servicewide Priority], should be deferred".

50. *Salt River Bay National Historical Park and Ecological Preserve, Virgin Islands*—General Management Plans: \$125,000 increase to \$0 request. "In addition, the Committee recommends \$125,000 within the general management plan budget for Salt River NHP, VI." (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

NPS: "Earmarking \$125,000 for Salt River will affect one or more of the GMP projects on the NPS priority list. Either amounts will be decreased on several projects, or the lowest ranked project (Wolf Trap Farm Park or Regional Office Projects) will be reduced substantially."

51. *Camino Real, New Mexico and Texas*—Special Resource Studies: \$150,000 increase to \$0 request. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

52. *El Paso Missions, Texas*—Special Resource Studies: \$150,000 increase to \$0 request. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

53. *Golden Gate Recreation Area, California*—Special Resource Studies: \$10,000 increase to \$0 request. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

54. *Hudson Valley Greenway, New York*—General Management Plans, Special Resource Studies: \$200,000 increase to \$0 request. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

55. *Rutherford B. Hayes, Ohio*—General Management Plans, Special Resource Studies: \$100,000 increase to \$0 request. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

56. *Toledo Urban Waterfront, Ohio*—General Management Plans, Special Resource Studies: \$150,000 increase to \$0 request. (House Report 103-158, page 32.)

57. *Emergency, Unscheduled, and Housing Projects*: \$750,000 increase to \$2,000,000 request.

The Committee recommends decreases totaling \$51,591,000 impacting 74 projects; decreases of \$45,642,000 for 15 line-item construction projects; a decrease of \$760,000 for special resource studies results in the elimination of 10 ongoing studies and 9 planned new studies; and a decrease of \$5,159,000 for 40 planning projects.

NPS LINE-ITEM CONSTRUCTION DECREASES:

\$46,415,000 FOR 15

1. *Biscayne National Park, Florida*: \$1,500,000 decrease of \$4,855,000 request for equipment exhibits, trails. "The reduction to the Biscayne NP, FL construction project defers the trails portion for a subsequent appropriation." (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "Defers mangrove restoration requiring more expensive phase".

2. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, Ohio*: \$3,930,000 decrease to \$5,055,000 request for Krejci toxic waste cleanup. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "The NPS is currently violating hazardous materials storage health and safety laws. If the full \$5,055,000 is not restored, the project will have to shut down. The State will issue a Notice of Violation against the Service. Restart of cleanup work in a future year will cost more because of mobilization costs."

3. *Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, Ohio*: \$275,000 decrease to \$400,000 request for Armington Dam No. 1 safety modifications. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Revised amount can be obligated".

4. *Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Pennsylvania*: \$1,250,000 decrease to \$1,250,000 request for Pahaquarry Copper Mines. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "High SWP [Servicewide Priority], safety concerns for mine stabilization".

5. *Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska*: \$1,487,000 decrease to \$1,487,000 request for mountain rescue center. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "High SWP [Servicewide Priority], leased building cannot handle increased rescue incidents".

6. Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska: \$2,200,000 decrease to \$2,200,000 request for Teklinika restrooms. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "If this project is not built, visitors on the popular park road will continue to use unhygienic portable chemical toilets and be forced to stand in line outdoors for extended periods of time in an area of heavy mosquito infestation and frequent storms."

7. Gateway National Recreation Area, New York: \$6,430,000 decrease to \$13,030,000 request for Great Kills Bathhouse. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "High SWP [Servicewide Priority], however, project could be phased, one year delay".

8. Great Smoky Mountains National Park, North Carolina: \$5,000,000 decrease to \$5,000,000 request for Oconaluftee Visitors Center infrastructure. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "High SWP [Servicewide Priority], deferral will increase costs."

9. John D. Rockefeller Parkway, Wyoming: \$2,159,000 decrease to \$2,859,000 request to relocate Flagg Ranch. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "The House substituted the \$700,000 component contained in the FY'93 Economic Stimulus Program for underground power lines in lieu of the FY'94 project to construct a contact station and staff housing. This means there will be no NPS visitor contact for interpretation or dissemination of safety information nor any public restrooms at the concessionaire's new Flagg Ranch facility."

10. Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, Alaska: \$1,015,000 decrease to \$1,015,000 request to restore Skagway Historic District. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "High SWP [Servicewide Priority]"

11. Martin Luther King, Jr., National Historic Site, Georgia: \$1,000,000 decrease to \$1,800,000 request to restore Birth Home block historic structures. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Dr. King's birthhome block contains structures that are deteriorated, historically inaccurate, and one important historic structure has already collapsed. Without full funding, the birthhome block, the historic resource of this park, will continue to be a substandard unit of the National Park System."

12. Martin Luther King, Jr., National Historic Site, Georgia: \$9,982,000 decrease to \$9,982,000 request for visitor facilities. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "Without this project, the park will not have a facility to interpret Dr. King's contribution to America, and, since current visitation cannot be handled by current facilities (parking and comfort stations, exhibits), the park will be totally unable to handle expected visitation during the Atlantic Olympic Games in 1996."

13. National Capitol Parks, District of Columbia: \$3,100,000 decrease to \$3,100,000 request to restore Washington Monument grounds. (House Report 103-158, page 30.)

NPS: "High SWP [Servicewide Priority], defers and makes more expensive first phase".

14. Yosemite National Park, California: \$1,214,000 decrease to \$1,214,000 request for sign plan implementation. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "Very high SWP [Servicewide Priority], safety concern disrupts visitor traffic flow".

15. Yosemite National Park, California: \$5,100,000 decrease to \$5,100,000 request to rehabilitate electrical system. (House Report 103-158, page 31.)

NPS: "Very high SWP [Servicewide Priority], poses severe safety issue, system rapidly decaying".

NPS, SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDIES DECREASES:
\$760,000 FOR ELIMINATION OF 19

1. African American Heritage, New Jersey/Pennsylvania—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

2. Agricultural/Industrial Heritage, Iowa—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

3. Bear Tooth Highway, Montana—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

4. Big Two-Hearted River, Michigan—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

5. Blood Run, Iowa—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

6. Carnegie Steel Mill Towns, Pennsylvania—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

7. Great Cypress Swamp, Delaware—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

8. Kennicott-McCarthy, Alaska—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

9. Oak Hill, Virginia—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for proposed new study.

10. Atchafalaya Basin, Louisiana—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

11. Bear River Massacre Site, Idaho—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

12. Buffalo Prairie National Park, Nebraska—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

13. Lower Eastern Shore, Maryland—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

14. Missouri National Recreation Center Area, Nebraska/South Dakota—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

15. New Jersey Delaware Bay, New Jersey—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

16. Route 66, Illinois/California—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

17. Susan B. Anthony, New York—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

18. Underground Railroad Study, Multi-State—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

19. Wounded Knee, South Dakota—Special Resource Studies: \$0 for ongoing study.

NPS, PLANNING DECREASES: \$5,189,000 IMPACTS 40

1. Acadia National Park, Maine—Planning: Decrease to \$150,000 request to restore carriage roads.

2. Alaska Regionwide—Planning: Decrease to \$550,000 request for regionwide employee housing.

3. Appalachian National Scenic Trail, Connecticut/Maine/Maryland/Massachusetts/New Hampshire/New Jersey/New York/Pennsylvania/Vermont/Virginia—Planning: Decrease to \$250,000 request to restore sites, rehabilitate structures, remove unsafe conditions.

4. Biscayne National Park, Florida—Planning: Decrease to \$150,000 request to replace visitor and support facilities.

5. Crater Lake National Park, Oregon—Planning: Decrease to \$383,000 request for re-evaluation of development concept plan/environmental assessment.

6. Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Pennsylvania/New Jersey—Planning: Decrease to \$1,300,000 request to rehabilitate visitor and support facilities.

7. Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska—Planning: Decrease to \$150,000 request for Teklanika comfort stations.

8. Denali National Park and Preserve, Alaska—Planning: Decrease to \$150,000 request for South Side Denali Environmental Impact Statement.

9. Fort Sumter National Monument, South Carolina—Planning: Decrease to \$200,000 request for Charleston tour boat facility, Phases I and II.

10. Gateway National Recreation Area, New York—Planning: Decrease to \$75,000 request for rehabilitation of Jacob Riis Bathhouse.

11. Gateway National Recreation Area, New York—Planning: Decrease to \$1,300,000 request for construction of Great Kills Park facilities.

12. Gateway National Recreation Area, New York—Planning: Decrease to \$400,000 request for Floyd Bennett Field water system repairs.

13. George Washington Memorial Parkway, Maryland—Planning: Decrease to \$1,200,000 request for Glen Echo utilities and buildings.

14. Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona—Planning: Decrease to \$600,000 request for employee housing.

15. Great Smoky Mountains National Park, North Carolina—Planning: Decrease to \$225,000 request for Oconaluftee visitor center.

16. Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, West Virginia—Planning: Decrease to \$750,000 request to rehabilitate Shipley and Grandview schools.

17. Independence National Historical Park, Pennsylvania—Planning: Decrease to \$7,564,000 request to rehabilitate Park utilities.

18. John D. Rockefeller Memorial Parkway, Wyoming—Planning: Decrease to \$425,000 request for Flagg Ranch facilities, Phase I and Phase II.

19. Kenai Fjords National Park, Alaska—Planning: Decrease to \$225,000 request for development concept plans.

20. Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, Alaska—Planning: Decrease to \$200,000 request to restore Skagway Historic District.

21. Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada/Arizona—Planning: Decrease to \$100,000 request to implement entrance station program.

22. Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park, Texas—Planning: Decrease to \$130,000 request to provide Park operations/headquarters building, Phase IV.

23. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site, Georgia—Planning: Decrease to \$850,000 request for visitor facilities and exhibits.

24. Mount Rainier National Park, Washington—Planning: Decrease to \$150,000 request to rehabilitate Paradise Valley water and sewer systems.

25. Mount Rainier National Park, Washington—Planning: Decrease to \$455,000 request to replace Sunrise Lodge.

26. Mount Rainier National Park, Washington—Planning: Decrease to \$97,000 request to replace employee dorm at Paradise.

27. National Capital Region, Central, District of Columbia—Planning: Decrease to \$1,260,000 request to restore Washington Monument grounds.

28. National Capital Region, Central, District of Columbia—Planning: Decrease to \$2,200,000 request for Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, Phase IV and future phases.

29. National Capital Region, White House, District of Columbia—Planning: Decrease to \$100,000 request to rehabilitate White House heating and air conditioning systems.

30. North Cascades National Park, Washington—Planning: Decrease to \$350,000 request for environmental impact statement for Stehekin implementation plan.

31. Ozark National Scenic Riverway, Missouri—Planning: Decrease to \$1,050,000 request for Akers Ferry Campground. Phases I and II.

32. Sequoia National Park, California—Planning: Decrease to \$1,180,000 request to replace Giant Forest facilities.

33. Shenandoah National Park, Virginia—Planning: Decrease to \$60,000 request for employee housing facilities development.

34. Upper Delaware Scenic and Recreational River, New York/New Jersey—Planning: Decrease to \$750,000 request for restoration of Roebling Bridge.

35. Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming/Montana—Planning: Decrease to \$800,000 request for employee housing, Phase I.

36. Yosemite National Park, California—Planning: Decrease to \$390,000 request to rehabilitate electrical system.

37. Yosemite National Park, California—Planning: Decrease to \$300,000 request to remove facilities from Yosemite Valley.

38. Yosemite National Park, California—Planning: Decrease to \$195,000 request for El Portal maintenance facilities.

39. Yosemite National Park, California—Planning: Decrease to \$750,000 request for El Portal employee housing.

40. Yosemite National Park, California—Planning: Decrease to \$250,000 request to implement parkwide sign program.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAWELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has some information, and I have not heard all of the gentleman's statement, but I would just suggest that the \$3,000 limitation he referred to only refers to where there is not a specific authorization for construction in a park. Very often there is.

Mr. FAWELL. Reclaiming my time, I would agree with the gentleman, if there is a specific authorization.

Mr. VENTO. Second, I would disagree with the gentleman and would point out specifically that the provision for the set-aside we made from the Historic Preservation Fund is entirely appropriate and consistent with the law, and is not in the same category as the other types of earmarks that have been appropriated that the gentleman has referenced. I also share many of the gentleman's concerns about unauthorized projects and earmarking in these projects. I did not hear the gentleman's entire statement, but I wanted to make certain that he knows I will work in good faith with him to establish sound policy based on legislative action.

Mr. FAWELL. I appreciate those words, and I do not think I basically disagree with them, as long as there is a specific authorization there. And I certainly have no problem in that regard.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the chairman and ranking member of the committee for the provisions in here relating to the insular areas, and also commend the staff for the work done, and urge support for H.R. 2250.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2250, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior for fiscal year 1994.

As chairman of the authorizing subcommittee with general jurisdiction over the U.S. insular areas which receive assistance through the Department of the Interior, I want to commend my friend and distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, SIDNEY YATES, for his hard work and dedication in bringing this bill to the floor today. I also want to express my thanks and appreciation to him for his continued sensitivity to the Federal responsibilities and needs of the U.S. insular areas.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2250 includes the President's request for reconstruction grants related to the devastation of Hurricane Hugo in the Virgin Islands. These funds are to complete essential projects at the University of the Virgin Islands, including renovations to bring facilities into compliance with basic safety standards. I testified before Chairman YATES' subcommittee in support of this request earlier this year and I am very pleased to see that this request for the University of the Virgin Islands was included in the bill before us today.

H.R. 2250 would also provide funding for land acquisition at the Salt River National Historical Park on St. Croix in the Virgin Islands which was established last year, as a result of legislation which I sponsored.

The de Lugo Salt River bill protects a unique complex of natural and cultural resources that goes back as far back as 2000 BC. It is a 912 acre park that will bring about an unprecedented degree of joint Federal/territorial management of the resources of the area.

The enactment of the de Lugo Salt River bill was an achievement of which I am particularly proud. It was the culmination of my efforts to save Salt River which began in 1958, when I sponsored legislation as a member of the local legislature of the Virgin Islands, to purchase 50 acres of the area including the 5-acre beach where Christopher Columbus landed on his second voyage to the New World.

Initially, there was little political support for a park at Salt River, partly because many did not understand the enormous economic benefits that such a park could generate for the island and the people of St. Croix. Also, many did not believe it was possible to establish a jointly managed park as my legislation did.

I wish to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks Forests and Public Lands, BRUCE VENTO and GEORGE MILLER, chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources for their support of this unique park. I also want to thank the Governor of the Virgin Islands, Alexander Farrelly, who has become a strong supporter of the park and whose wife is a member of the management commission.

I also want to thank Virgin Islanders like Jessie Thompson, Rudy O'Reilly, Jr., and William J. Cissel, a noted historian with the National Park Service on St. Croix, for their support as well. In addition, I would like to thank groups like the St. Croix Environmental Association and the Nature Conservancy and Liz Wilson and Helen Gessing of the League of Women's Voters for their help also.

Salt River continues to enjoy widespread support in the Virgin Islands, and I am very

hopeful that with the enactment of this legislation we can begin the process of making this truly unique national treasure a reality.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank Chairman YATES for his support of the needs of the other insular areas particularly American Samoa and Palau where there continues to be great needs but with very little economic resources for the people there to draw upon to help meet these needs.

In conclusion I want to again thank the chairman of the Subcommittee, Chairman YATES, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, RALPH REGULA, for the support they have shown to the people of the U.S. off-shore areas. I also want to thank the chairman of the full Appropriations committee, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, BILL NATCHER for his support as well, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 46, line 17, strike "\$155,903,000" and insert "\$148,955,000".

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike the funding of \$6.9 million for the Forest Legacy Program. This is another case of the Federal Government attempting to purchase additional parkland when we do not even have the resources to take care of the parks that we already have and wilderness areas we already have in this country.

Under the Forest Legacy Program the Federal Government has authority to purchase virtually any woodland with the potential for development. Given the current economic circumstances, taxpayers do not need to see further erosion in their property tax base, especially in rural areas. The Federal Government confiscates the property or takes the property, and it erodes the property tax base, and it hurts local communities around this country that rely on property taxes to run their local governments.

Given today's economic conditions, how can Congress justify spending \$6.9 million on this program?

The Forest Legacy Program was enacted by circumventing the normal committee process. No public hearings were held, no input from local government was ever requested. It was never even debated by either the House or the Senate.

This money would be far better spent on forest management and fire protection for our current forests rather than further expansion.

I would like to also point out that the Forest Legacy Program is strongly opposed by the American Farm Bureau. Let me quote what the Farm Bureau said about this program.

As written, the authority to purchase forest land or place easements on forest land is not limited to lands that offer unique or significant environmental values. Instead, it

extends well beyond environmentally valuable lands to make eligible for Federal purchase virtually any woodland that may be developed.

Second, as organization of landowners and taxpayers, a large portion of whom own forest and woodland, we do not consider the purchase of land that offers no unique and special value a wise public policy or an efficient use of tax dollars.

Third, furthermore, we do not need to see further reduction in the property tax base, especially in rural areas.

Fourth, and finally, from the standpoint of private property rights, we are concerned about the impact this legislation has on those entering the long-term contracts as well as on adjacent and nearby property owners. We believe that the forest legacy program will result in a further erosion of private property rights.

There have been no open hearings in the House or Senate on this program. It was established with the support of environmental extremists in the 1990 farm bill, literally in the dead of night and behind closed doors.

The program is opposed by the forest products industry. It is opposed by the American Farm Bureau and opposed by property rights organizations.

I hope my colleagues will show their support for the Farm Bureau and the people who want to keep their property without Government infringement by supporting this amendment, and I hope my colleagues on the committee will look with favor on supporting it.

□ 1530

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment may close in 5 minutes, if that is acceptable to the gentleman, and that I be allowed to control 3 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] be allowed to control the remaining 2 minutes, if he wants it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this program was authorized in the 1990 farm bill to meet a need identified in a study requested by Congress to provide a mechanism for conserving and protecting forest lands in the New England States, New York, and Washington State. Only local governments who are willing to participate may receive funding to acquire easements which will then provide for long-term protection of remaining forest lands in these States.

The goal is to conserve environmentally important private forest lands threatened with conversion to nonforest uses. For some cases, the right to public access becomes part of the conservation easement.

This was a program, Mr. Chairman, that was initially funded in the Senate, and as far as the House is concerned, we went along with the Senate on this.

The amendment offered by the gentleman is one that, I think, ought to be opposed. It does offer opportunities for those municipalities, and only those municipalities, that want to participate, and I would urge a vote against the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON. of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I support this amendment.

We have 750 million acres of land now in the public domain. We have a tough time, as we have heard in the last 2 days, financing what we have. Let us not start taking more. Certainly in this Nation we have a great respect for property rights and, therefore, in this instance, I do not think, this program makes good policy. I certainly support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just would urge a vote against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON. of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just end up by saying to my colleagues that there have been no open hearings on this bill. It is opposed by the Farm Bureau. It is opposed by many private-property-rights organizations, and local governments opposite it because it allows the Federal Government to take property away, and that erodes their property tax base.

This is a very good amendment, and I hope you will support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POMBO

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POMBO: Page 11, line 20, strike "\$61,610,000" and insert "\$60,610,000".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMBO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] and 5 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request is for 10 minutes, 5 minutes on each side.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. I will agree to 10 minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] does not agree to that unanimous-consent request. He suggests that it be 10 minutes on each side.

Mr. YATES. All right. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my request to make it 10 minutes on each side to the amendment, and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. To this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will cut \$1 million from H.R. 2520, the Department of the Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1994.

I propose to reduce the Fish and Wildlife Service acquisition appropriation by \$1 million.

It is my intention to have this \$1 million cut come from funds intended for my district.

The committee report provides that \$1 million be directed toward the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge, the vast majority of which is included in my congressional district.

Many of my constituents who reside near this refuge are opposed to the Stone Lakes Refuge.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give a few reasons why. One of the main reasons that has come up over the last couple of years that we have been working on this issue is the health reason. We have the potential of creating a health problem in a very populated area and an area nearby which is planned for development.

I would like to read, if I may, an excerpt from a letter that was sent October 7, 1991, from the Department of Health Services in Sacramento. It states:

I am concerned about locating this refuge in particular, and any wildlife refuge in general, adjacent to human habitation. The draft environmental impact statement [DEIS] does not address the potential public health impact from production of insects and other animals which may harbor or transmit disease organisms to man.

A major concern is mosquitoes. When land is intermittently flooded, several species of mosquitoes may be produced. Not only are floodwater mosquitoes voracious feeders and therefore directly injurious, but one common species has been implicated in the transmission cycle of Western equine encephalitis, a serious disease of horses and humans. Quiescent water gives rise to the carriers of

western equine and St. Louis encephalitis and of malaria, all of which have occurred in the area of the proposed refuge.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to make comment as to a letter sent out by the mosquito and vector control district on April 1 of this year, and a portion of the letter states:

As a Board we are mindful of the consequences of being constrained from doing our job of mosquito abatement and the effect this could have on nearby urban populations of Laguna, Elk Grove and South Sacramento neighborhoods. It seems as a society we have forgotten how important mosquito control is. Many think only of the nuisance caused by mosquito populations. The truth of the matter is that these mosquitoes can pose a significant health risk as they can transmit many harmful disease organisms to man.

Mr. Chairman, those are just a couple of things that have been pointed out recently on the health issue, and it is becoming a serious issue in the northern part of my district.

Recently, we have had an outbreak of equine encephalitis in the area, and it is of immense concern to myself and to many of my constituents as to how we handle that matter.

The other issue that has been brought out by my constituents has to do with property rights. I believe that it is extremely important that we protect the property rights of our citizens.

These particular farmers and ranchers who are in this area feel that they have not had their day in court, so to speak, and have not had their property rights effected. What happens many times with the Fish and Wildlife Service is they will step in and designate an area as a future wildlife refuge, which devalues the property in the area and puts restrictions on what they are able to do in the area. What has happened in this particular area is many of the ranchers and farmers are having a difficult time obtaining financing because of the wildlife-refuge designation, and I feel that it is important to preserve the property rights of those who are affected.

Mr. Chairman, I am including at this point in the RECORD the letter dated October 7, 1991, from the Department of Health Services, and the letter dated April 1, 1993, from the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES,
Sacramento, CA, October 7, 1991.

PETER JEROME,
Refuge Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Sacramento, CA.

DEAR MR. JEROME: Thank you for the opportunity to make comments on the "Jones and Stokes Associates, Inc., 1991. Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. Draft (JSA 91-046.) Sacramento, California."

I am concerned about locating this refuge in particular, and any wildlife refuge in general, adjacent to human habitation. The draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) does not address the potential public health impact from production of insects and other animals which may harbor or transmit disease organisms to man.

A major concern is mosquitoes. When land is intermittently flooded, several species of mosquitoes may be produced. Not only are floodwater mosquitoes voracious feeders and therefore directly injurious, but one common species has been implicated in the transmission cycle of western equine encephalitis, a serious disease of horses and humans. Quiescent water gives rise to the carriers of western equine and St. Louis encephalitis and of malaria, all of which have occurred in the area of the proposed refuge.

The recent actions of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the project consultants in working with the local mosquito and vector control district is commendable and supported by the Department. However, I am concerned that a system, however well designed, can fail unless properly operated and maintained. Existing refuges in the Sacramento Valley continually undergo mosquito surveillance and chemical control efforts by local agencies. Furthermore, I am made extremely uncomfortable by the stated efforts by some refuges elsewhere in the nation to use "incompatible activities" as reasoning to get out from under the jurisdiction of mosquito abatement agencies. The DEIS does not address the use of pesticides for public health. While I strongly favor limited use of pesticides, I equally strongly support the judicious use of chemical mosquito control to protect people from mosquitoes and mosquito-borne diseases.

Diseases such as Lyme disease and rabies may be problems associated with the proposed refuge. We are just learning to understand the distribution of Lyme disease, transmitted by ticks. Rabies, however, is known to be endemic in the area. The proposed refuge will support increased numbers of skunks and promote an increase in the incidence of rabies.

There is a place for refuges, certainly. That place however, is not immediately adjacent to existing or planned residential areas.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 445-0498.

Sincerely,

DON J. WOMELDORF,

Chief, Environmental Management Branch.

SACRAMENTO-YOLO MOSQUITO AND
VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT,
Sacramento, CA, April 1, 1993.

Re Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge—
South Sacramento Preservation Council
versus Plenert.

HOWARD ELLMAN,
Ellman, Burke, Hoffman & Johnson, San Francisco, CA.

DEAR MR. ELLMAN: This letter is to inform you of the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District, Board decision, to instruct its counsel to seek leave of the court to file a non-party amicus curiae ("Friend of the court") brief in support of plaintiffs' case. Said case focuses on the potential mosquito impacts and the failure and reluctance of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USF&WS) to date to fully disclose and mitigate mosquito impacts resulting from the creation of Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge. We have been attempting in good faith to reach a memorandum of understanding (MOU) for more than a year with the USF&WS to no use. Despite these good faith efforts by the district, we have not come very far toward a workable MOU that is acceptable to the District. Further, unless the Service commits to adequate funding even a well worded MOU is useless in the fight for a decent level of public health and safety.

It is interesting that the complaint alleges that the "Service is currently engaged in disputes with mosquito abatement districts in the Sacramento Valley who contend that the Service is obstructing abatement on other refuges, material facts that cast out on the efficacy of vague promises of 'cooperation' and non binding management agreements." (Complaint, p. 16.) This is a clear reference to the recent discussions with Service personnel concerning the problems encountered by the Colusa Mosquito Abatement District in its efforts to apply pesticides last year at the Colusa National Wildlife Refuge. The Sacramento-Yolo District and its staff have been participating in these discussions because of similar problems that are anticipated concerning pesticide application at the Stone Lakes National Wildlife refuge.

As a Board we are mindful of the consequences of being constrained from doing our job of mosquito abatement and the effect this could have on nearby urban populations of Laguna, Elk Grove and South Sacramento neighborhoods. It seems as a society we have forgotten how important mosquito control is. Many think only of the nuisance caused by mosquito populations. The truth of the matter is that these mosquitoes can pose a significant health risk as they can transmit many harmful disease organisms to man.

We feel it is our responsibility to protect our ability to do our job in the most effective manner possible unhampered by unreasonable Federal Government constraints. To that end we have instructed our counsel Mr. Shanahan to cooperate with you fully as he prepares our amicus curiae brief. Further, we have instructed our staff to cooperate with you in providing any information about vector control that you require and is in their ability to provide, also to cooperate with you on providing details of our negotiations with the USF&WS to develop a MOU. If you need any further help please don't hesitate to call me directly. We look forward to a positive solution to these troublesome issues.

Sincerely,

JOHN GOLDEN,
President, Sacramento-Yolo
Mosquito and Vector Control Board.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

First of all, I want to say that this wildlife refuge is located in southern Sacramento County, an area that I represented prior to reapportionment. The gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] has inherited a concern that I dealt with for a number of years.

I might say that I was the last elected official to sign on to the support for Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, after spending a good deal of time working on behalf of the farmers and landowners in the area. But I have now done so, and I rise in opposition to striking the funds, knowing full well that this project has very broad bipartisan support.

It was supported by both the administration of President Bush before President Clinton requested funds again this year.

The committee was unable to proceed last year because of a moratorium on new starts.

It also has the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of the subcommittee and a Republican member of the California delegation, and I believe the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is predicated on the continuing support of Governor Wilson. The Governor recently signed into law funding for State purchase of land from willing sellers in this area. He chose not to blue-pencil, or line-item veto, language that funded the State contribution. The Governor continues to support this project.

□ 1540

The refuge also has strong bipartisan support at the local level. The mayor and the city council in Sacramento support it. The chairman of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors also. In fact, as I think I have already indicated, I was the last public official to support this.

I was the author of a provision that directed the Fish and Wildlife Service to study the possibility of creating this refuge. But it was only after I worked with local landowners and helped gain significant protections for agriculture in southern Sacramento County that I officially endorsed the project.

A number of accommodations have been made to address the concerns of the landowners, many of whom are involved in agriculture. Mr. POMBO and others have asserted that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has not taken into consideration the concerns of these individuals. I really think they have.

At my request, the American Farmland Trust stepped in to help negotiate a settlement to the conflicts between the landowners and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The American Farmland Trust, a national organization of farmers committed to voluntary habitat protection, worked with the service and the landowners to see that the concerns of agriculture were addressed. An agreement was struck that addressed the vast majority of the concerns raised by the landowners, and the American Farmland Trust has endorsed the creation of this important refuge.

No less than seven major concessions were made to landowners in the area in response to the concerns they raised.

KEY CONCESSIONS

In general, the agreement directed USFWS to reduce the size of the refuge, delete significant agricultural areas from the refuge boundary, and protect wildlife and habitat values primarily through cooperative agreements and the purchase of conservation easements.

The key compromises reached, included the following:

The fee acquisition of land by USFWS was reduced by more than two-thirds of what was originally proposed for acquisition, from 9,167 acres to no more than 3,017 acres.

USFWS adopted a policy of making all acquisitions on a willing seller basis. To emphasize this point, our committee included language in last year's report to accompany the Interior appropriations bill which stated that "all land acquisitions shall be from willing sellers only, consistent with the environmental impact statement."

The committee further directed USFWS to minimize, to the greatest degree practicable, the fee acquisition of existing farm land. As a response to this language and at the urging of the American Farmland Trust, USFWS added a provision to the Record of Decision that requires the Service to cooperate with landowners, private organizations and county, State and Federal agencies to minimize the need for fee acquisitions of existing farmlands in the core area of the refuge.

The Service also adopted a provision in the EIS that will prohibit the re-introduction of federally listed threatened or endangered species, so there will be no future issue of that as the wildlife refuge boundaries are flushed out.

The Service agreed to create appropriate buffers on USFWS-controlled lands wherever wetlands are established next to private agricultural lands, in order to avoid conflicts with adjacent landowners, particularly over pesticide and herbicide use.

The Service agreed to work with the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito Vector Control District to establish a memorandum of understanding that would define wetland design criteria and annual operating procedures for the control of mosquitoes at the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge.

By the way, I want to make very clear that in a June 23 letter to Mr. POMBO from the Mosquito Vector Control District, they stipulate that a position of theirs was mistakenly reported and that the board of trustees of the district has never gone on record in opposition to this wildlife refuge's creation. I think it is important to make clear that the public health of the community is being given consideration. That letter makes it clear that we are working together, and a memorandum of understanding has been reached so that there will not be any breakout of infectious diseases based on the wetland's creation.

In addition, I want to say that this binding and meaningful agreement between the mosquito abatement district and the Fish and Wildlife Service is in place and I believe we can, through the use of binding arbitration over disputes between the agencies, make sure that the public health and safety is protected.

I think we have gone a long way to minimize the environmental impact of this on the surrounding landowners and farmers. I think we have made every legitimate effort that we could to accommodate the concerns of people in the region. But this is not simply a local project; it is an extremely important one for the entire Sacramento area, and I believe we have gone about as far as we can go to accommodate the legitimate concerns of people who, I maintain, in some instances still utilizing their right to go to court, oppose the project.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with this area as well. I was approached by some of the unhappy landowners who are very much opposed to creating this refuge and they asked me to visit the site. At the time, this was near my district, which is now that area taken over by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO]. He now represents the area previously represented by Mr. FAZIO, where much of this property is located.

What struck me was that this is prime farmland. This is undoubtedly some of the finest farmland in the United States. These landowners are very happy farming it.

They are terribly opposed to having this idea of this kind of wildlife refuge established there which will preclude them from carrying on their business. It is very hotly contested.

You know, like so many other things, if we had the money as a Government and we did not have a deficit and we had a surplus in terms of having no national debt, maybe this would be one thing to consider someplace—not here, but someplace.

But the fact of the matter is that we are going to be borrowing money to buy up more public land. We cannot properly manage the public land we have now, as we have heard from both sides of the aisle in earlier parts of the debate today.

Here we are going to buy up even more land. I think this is a terrible mistake. I certainly support the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], and would urge Members to support him in that.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion on this, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], and I have talked about this since I have been in Congress. Even though I am a new Member, one of the first groups that approached me, as a new Member, was

the affected farmers and ranchers and landowners in this area about their concerns for this project and what it was going to do to them.

I spent a good deal of time with them going over what their issues were, and I have to agree with them that they were having part of their property rights taken away from them.

They felt that the Fish and Wildlife Service was coming in with a heavy hand and coming down on top of them.

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] pointed out previously that buffer zones had been created as part of this agreement. What scares all these farmers is that because they are unwilling sellers, that they have now become buffer zones. That would further restrict their farming activities in the area.

□ 1550

Most of these guys have been there for a great deal of time. They are very happy doing what they are doing. They have no intention of doing anything else, and they would like the opportunity for their farms to go on to their children and their grandchildren. They are very concerned about the creation of another wildlife refuge in the area.

There is another wildlife refuge that is located about 30 miles south of here that is underfunded, as this one would be, even with the \$1 million passed.

One of my major concerns about this kind of legislation is what we are in effect doing. We are in effect creating wildlife refuges all over the country without the money to fund buying them; so we will go in and we will put a little bit of money in to start the process and buy a small part of it and restrict the use of all the rest of the land, and in the meantime we do not have the money to buy it.

So we are in effect taking part of the property rights of these individuals without paying them for it and we have no hope of being able to pay for it as this country continues to slip further and further into debt. This is a major concern of mine and it is a concern of many Members of this body, as has been voiced already today.

If you are going to go in and take people's lands, whether it is through regulatory taking or whether it is just through drawing a funny color on a map over their property, then you have got to pay them for it. This does neither. This takes their property and it does not pay the owners that are affected. That is what I am trying to stop here.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say there is a current lawsuit that has been filed on this. They hope to go to court sometime in September. Hopefully within the near future there will be some kind of settlement. The property owners will feel their day in court has been heard and we will not have these kinds of battles in the future.

It is my hope to delay any funding for this until at least that time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, the gentleman from Sacramento, CA [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

As the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has indicated, this has strong bipartisan support in northern California and throughout the State of California. The Governor's office, Pete Wilson's office, supports this.

This initiative actually began under President Reagan. President Reagan and President Bush did long-term environmental studies. We are talking about a 12- to 13-year study that, last year on July 17, 1992, culminated in declaring this area a National Wildlife Refuge.

The reason for it is because this has major value in terms of a major wetlands area, the only wetlands area left in northern California.

What we are talking about here is a mere \$1 million only, only for willing sellers. This is not going to be done through condemnation.

This is an effort that has been going on approximately 12 to 15 years. It has strong bipartisan support. The city council of Sacramento, which is comprised of Democrats and Republicans, and the board of supervisors of Sacramento, bipartisan support for this effort as well. It is a project that the decision was already made.

Second, as the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has mentioned, the manager of the Sacramento Mosquito District, Allen Hubbard, says:

I am not aware that there has ever been any opposition in any board meeting on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge.

This was dated June 23, 1993, just a month ago.

So this project is one in which we have to move ahead on. We are asking for \$1 million. We originally asked for \$12 million. Now it is \$1 million for only purchases from willing sellers.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the membership strongly votes "no" on this amendment.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in support of the appropriation for willing seller land acquisition at the Stone Lake National Wildlife Refuge. This project and the other acquisition projects supported by H.R. 2520 are vitally important to California as our State becomes even more heavily populated and open spaces and natural areas continue to diminish.

A portion of the Stone Lakes Refuge is located in the southern portion of my congressional district. California's rapidly increasing

population places tremendous pressure on available land and resources, and population patterns and development have decreased the amount of lands available to flora and fauna. Native Central Valley plant communities and their associated fish, wildlife, and plant species are at risk, and we must act now if we are to preserve the natural diversity which make California such a beautiful and appealing State.

Stone Lakes goes a long way toward achieving the goal of preserving both wildlife and necessary habitat. Standing alone, Stone Lakes is a vital part of Sacramento's plan for preserving our natural environment in the context of a rapidly expanding metropolitan area. But Stone Lakes is also a major link in California's chain of wetlands and wildlife refuges which has been sorely overburdened and taxed to the brink by urban development patterns, agricultural needs, and water resources and flood control projects.

Over the past 20 years, the decline of a significant portion of our aquatic natural resources in California has contributed to a steady decrease in waterfowl and other wildlife populations. The \$1 million earmarked for the acquisition of prime wildlife property from willing sellers will help ensure the viability of this resource, so important to endangered, threatened, candidate, sensitive, and special concern species, as well as to waterfowl and shorebirds which make heavy use of the area in winter and as a migratory staging area.

Local government officials have expressed strong support for Stone Lakes, which would greatly increase the valley's carrying capacity for migratory waterfowl and help restore the Sacramento Valley to its earlier state in which incredible numbers of waterfowl and other fauna and flora made the area spectacularly alive. Support comes from the mayor of Sacramento, the chairman of the Sacramento Board of Supervisors, and local State government elected officials. It is my hope that the House will recognize the importance of this project and will support Stone Lakes so that species such as the American coot, the American avocet, the Swainson's hawk, the pied-billed grebe, and the long-billed marsh wren can live and flourish in California.

My colleague from Tracy, Mr. POMBO, has put forward several reasons why he is opposed to preserving this superb natural resource which will be visited by thousands of Sacramentans and other northern California residents each year. I strongly disagree with the position of my colleague, and I would like to discuss briefly why the issues he raises are red herrings and should be discarded.

In a letter dated June 15th of this year and distributed to Members of the House of Representatives, my colleague stated that he opposed Stone Lakes because the refuge would create "a perfect wetland habitat for mosquitoes * * *". Setting aside the issue of whether California needs to protect its wetlands resources, as it most assuredly does, my colleague's public health concerns are really without merit. There is no question that we must be concerned about health risks associated with mosquitoes and other wildlife. However, just 2 days ago the local abatement district voted to sign the memorandum of understanding it has painstakingly developed over

the past few months with the Department of Fish and Wildlife, an MOU which details the abatement plan which will protect against an overabundance of mosquitoes at Stone Lakes.

My colleague's letter states that the Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito and Vector Control District opposes Stone Lakes. This simply is not true. The manager of the district has informed Mr. POMBO that the district is not opposed to Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge. In fact, Stone Lakes enjoys wide-spread support throughout Sacramento. Supporters include elected officials, Government agencies, and the people of Sacramento.

My colleague's letter also states that "the local tax base would be damaged by the loss of this productive acreage." My colleague from Tracy fails to take into account the fact that Stone Lakes is an extremely important resource which will preserve Sacramento's unique and attractive environment. People from all over the country move to Sacramento precisely because of our region's rich natural beauty. Sacramento is still a uniquely hospitable large city. The Stone Lakes Refuge will help preserve Sacramento's attractiveness to my constituents and others, and will help preserve our tax base as well. Ugly cities will eventually drive people away and will rot the tax base. Rather than hurting our city's revenues, I am certain that Stone Lakes will actually enhance our tax base.

A liveable environment creates jobs and spurs economic growth. Stone Lakes will help preserve the beauty of California and will help ensure that the Central Valley remains an economically vibrant area in the long run. And the importance of Stone Lakes cannot be viewed myopically; what happens at Stone Lakes affects wildlife throughout the Western United States. If Stone Lakes is not preserved, another key link in the chain of refuges for migratory and shore birds will be lost, and the famous Pacific Flyway will be damaged. In order to preserve the human and natural environment throughout the west coast, we must take action and preserve areas like Stone Lakes. Not only for the future of the flora and fauna which are dependent on the resource, but also for our children and their children, so they might be able to enjoy the natural beauty of the great Central Valley and the wildlife that makes northern California such a unique place to live.

Mr. POMBO is also concerned about the rights of property owners. I can assure my colleagues that Stone Lakes respects the rights of landowners. Land will be acquired only from willing sellers, and the Fish and Wildlife Service is precluded from forcing property owners to sell their land. Additionally, buffer zones are included in the plans for Stone Lakes in order to minimize any problems with farmers who use pesticides and herbicides.

Flood control concerns have also been raised with respect to Stone Lakes but, as with the others, this objection is another red herring. The Department of Fish and Wildlife has determined that the establishment of Stone Lakes will not have significant hydrologic effects on the Stone Lakes area and would have minimal conflicts with ongoing flood protection and levee management in Sacramento. Flood control is constantly at the forefront of my thoughts as Sacramento is still

in serious jeopardy of suffering tremendous damage and loss of life from floods. If I believed Stone Lakes would increase our flood risk, I would oppose the project, at least until Sacramento achieves adequate flood protection. But Stone Lakes does not aggravate our flood control problem according to experts, and so this issue is merely a distraction.

Mr. Chairman, the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge is vitally important to the protection of California's wildlife. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and I urge you to defeat the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POMBO) there were—ayes 17, noes 25.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 246, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—174

Allard	Goodlatte	Minge
Archer	Goodling	Molinari
Bachus (AL)	Goss	Montgomery
Baker (CA)	Grams	Moorhead
Baker (LA)	Grandy	Myers
Ballenger	Greenwood	Nussle
Barrett (NE)	Gunderson	Orton
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Oxley
Barton	Hancock	Paxon
Bentley	Hansen	Penny
Bereuter	Hastert	Petri
Bilirakis	Hefley	Pombo
Bliley	Herger	Porter
Blute	Hobson	Portman
Boehert	Hoke	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Horn	Quillen
Bonilla	Houghton	Quinn
Bunning	Huffington	Ramstad
Burton	Hunter	Regula
Buyer	Hutchinson	Ridge
Callahan	Hyde	Roberts
Calvert	Inglis	Rogers
Canady	Inhofe	Rohrabacher
Castle	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Clinger	Jacobs	Roth
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Santorum
Combust	Kanjorski	Saxton
Condit	Kaptur	Schaefer
Cox	Kasich	Schiff
Crane	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Crapo	King	Shaw
Cunningham	Kingston	Shuster
Deal	Klug	Skeen
DeLay	Knollenberg	Slattery
Diaz-Balart	Kyl	Smith (MI)
Dickey	Laughlin	Smith (NJ)
Doolittle	Lazio	Smith (OR)
Dornan	Leach	Smith (TX)
Dreier	Levy	Snowe
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Dunn	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Emerson	Lightfoot	Stearns
Everett	Linder	Stenholm
Fawell	Livingston	Stump
Fields (TX)	Machtley	Sundquist
Fish	Manzullo	Talent
Fowler	McCandless	Tauzin
Franks (CT)	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Thomas (CA)
Galleghy	McHugh	Thomas (WY)
Gallo	McInnis	Valentine
Gekas	McKeon	Vucanovich
Geren	McMillan	Walker
Gillmor	Mica	
Gilman	Michel	
Gingrich	Miller (FL)	

Walsh
WeldonWolf
Young (AK)Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—246

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Pastor
Ackerman	Gordon	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (ME)	Green	Payne (VA)
Andrews (NJ)	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Andrews (TX)	Hall (OH)	Peterson (FL)
Applegate	Hamburg	Peterson (MN)
Bacchus (FL)	Hamilton	Pickett
Baessler	Harman	Pickle
Barca	Hayes	Pomeroy
Barcia	Hefner	Poshard
Barlow	Hilliard	Price (NC)
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Rahall
Bateman	Hoagland	Rangel
Becerra	Hoekstra	Ravenel
Beilenson	Holden	Reed
Berman	Hughes	Reynolds
Bilbray	Hutto	Richardson
Bishop	Insee	Roemer
Blackwell	Jefferson	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Borski	Johnson (GA)	Rose
Boucher	Johnson (SD)	Rostenkowski
Brewster	Johnson, E.B.	Roukema
Brooks	Johnston	Rowland
Browder	Kennedy	Rowland-Allard
Brown (CA)	Kennelly	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kleczka	Sanders
Bryant	Klein	Sangmeister
Byrne	Klink	Sawyer
Camp	Kopetski	Schenk
Cantwell	Kreidler	Schroeder
Cardin	LaFalce	Schumer
Carr	Lambert	Scott
Chapman	Lancaster	Serrano
Clay	Lantos	Sharp
Clayton	LaRocco	Shays
Clement	Levin	Shepherd
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Collins (IL)	Lipinski	Skaggs
Collins (MI)	Lloyd	Skelton
Cooper	Long	Slaughter
Coppersmith	Lowey	Smith (IA)
Costello	Maloney	Spratt
Coyne	Mann	Stark
Cramer	Manton	Stokes
Danner	Margolies	Strickland
Darden	Mezvinsky	Studds
de la Garza	Markey	Stupak
de Lugo (VI)	Martinez	Swett
DeFazio	Matsui	Swift
DeLauro	Mazzoli	Synar
Dellums	McCloskey	Tanner
Derrick	McCurdy	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	McDade	Tejeda
Dicks	McDermott	Thompson
Dingell	McHale	Thornton
Dixon	McNulty	Thurman
Dooley	Meehan	Torkildsen
Durbin	Meek	Torricelli
Edwards (CA)	Menendez	Traffant
Edwards (TX)	Meyers	Tucker
Engel	Mfume	Underwood (GU)
English (AZ)	Miller (CA)	Unsoeld
English (OK)	Mineta	Upton
Eshoo	Mink	Velazquez
Evans	Moakley	Vento
Ewing	Mollohan	Visclosky
Farr	Moran	Volkmer
Fazio	Morella	Waters
Fields (LA)	Murphy	Watt
Filner	Murtha	Waxman
Fingerhut	Nadler	Wheat
Flake	Natcher	Whitten
Foglietta	Neal (MA)	Williams
Ford (MI)	Neal (NC)	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Norton (DC)	Wise
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Woolsey
Frost	Obey	Wyden
Furse	Oliver	Wynn
Gejdenson	Ortiz	Yates
Gibbons	Owens	Zimmer
Gilchrest	Pallone	
Glickman	Parker	

NOT VOTING—19

Armey	Faleomavaega	Hochbrueckner
Bevill	(AS)	Hoyer
Bonior	Gephardt	Kolbe
Coleman	Hastings	Lehman
Conyers	Henry	

McKinney Sarpallus Towns
Packard Torres Washington

□ 1614

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Kolbe for, with Mr. McKinney against.

Mr. SKELTON and Mr. HOEKSTRA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. LIVINGSTON, SMITH of New Jersey, FISH, and LAZIO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. BLACKWELL changed his vote from "present" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 46, line 11, strike "\$16,996,000" and insert "\$11,996,000".

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut \$5 million from the Forests for the Future Program. This bill originally had increased it by \$10 million. I have reached an agreement with both the chairman and the ranking Republican on this committee to cut this by \$5 million. Because of that, I will not elaborate further on the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is correct. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I want to say we accept the amendment, and also add this is a good amendment. I would have liked to have seen \$10 million. I think this is a bad program, but at least \$5 million is progress. For that reason, we are very enthusiastic about accepting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in a moment we will have the potential of a motion to rise. Some of us will be seeking to defeat the motion to rise in order to get to an amendment that seeks to set aside some money for fiscal 1994 for purposes of providing Midwest flood relief. The President has made a good faith effort, and I am supportive of what he is attempting to do, in moving in fiscal 1993 to provide some immediate help to the people in the Midwest. There is no doubt that is needed.

But the fact is we already know there is going to be obligations in 1994. We know that the extent of the damage is so massive that we are going to have obligations in 1994.

Mr. Chairman, some of us believe that the way to begin to prepare for that is by setting aside some money now that could be used for that kind of damage protection. So I will be offering an amendment that would set aside 1 percent of the funds in this bill, and we would hope to do it in each of the appropriation bills, that would give us about a \$3 million to \$5 billion pool that could be used to provide the help that will be necessary in the Midwest in fiscal 1994. It seems to me it is appropriate that we do something, where we know we have got an obligation ahead of us, that will assure that we do it in a fiscally responsible way. This is a way we can do it.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the gentleman being allowed to offer this amendment and defeating the motion to rise, for the following reasons: In about 15 minutes Members from the Midwest will be meeting with the President to talk about the disaster package. My conservative estimate at this point is it will be closer to \$5 billion than the \$2.5 billion the President has predicted. That is because the damage is not yet complete.

Yet we will, during these discussions, be talking about the need to provide better benefits through crop insurance, the need to provide better coverage through flood insurance, and it seems to me appropriate that this Congress begins to start buying insurance against the disasters that we have seen every year since this gentleman has been a Member. Although we cannot predict a disaster, we can certainly presume one will occur.

It is clearly worth a percentage of our appropriation bills annually to be set aside in a disaster contingency fund to prepare for these eventualities. If they are not spent, so much the better. Then the deficit is reduced accordingly, or we roll them into the next year. But emergency funding mechanisms, although convenient, add to the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important issue, and I hope it will allow us to change some of the precedents that we use in this body to fund disaster programs. There are usually disasters. We do not know where the money comes from. But I think this is an opportunity to discuss this fully, and I hope that when the motion comes to rise, it will be defeated simply to put this issue on the table. It is something I intend to bring up with the President at

these meetings, and I hope that whatever happens today will be a signal to the administration that we want to find appropriate ways to buy insurance to prepare for these eventualities. We ask our constituents to buy crop insurance, to buy flood insurance.

□ 1620

We should be asking ourselves to buy disaster insurance.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that at the time of the 1990 Budget Agreement, it was presumed there would be these emergencies, and the cap was set lower so there would be room for emergencies. So it is already taken care of in the 1990 Budget Agreement.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. The problem is, however, that the deficit has continued to mount. And one way that we can begin to prepare to bring down some of the deficit numbers would be to set aside some money that we know is going to be spent.

I do not think the gentleman would disagree with me, knowing in his State that we are probably going to incur at least \$3 billion and probably as much as \$5 billion of obligation in the next year.

This is simply an attempt to begin to deal with that situation now in a responsible way.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I also support his effort to do this. If a family found themselves in a situation like this, they would have to trim back on their own budget for their own emergency that they found. We need to do the same thing.

That is not to diminish the necessity for the emergency funds or the need for the disaster at all. But I join many flooded State Members that say, look, we have to start paying for these obligations.

I am also joining a group of Members that will today send a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to ask to work together in order to find those offsets.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman realizes that we have this bill plus, as I understand, three more, is all that is remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, in order to try to recoup, at 1 percent, unless we take most of it out of defense, I do not see that we are going to arrive at the gentleman's figure. One percent out of this bill right now is only about \$100 million.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is my intention, and I have already begun the process of talking to the Senate about if this House indicates that this is a direction they would like to go, we think we can find sponsors in the Senate to take the same kind of effort there so that it would be a conferencable item on each of the appropriations bills, as they come through. But we can start the process here by showing the Senate that this is what our intention is.

We will have a couple of other appropriations bills and the total of that would get us to the \$3 billion to \$5 billion.

I am aware of that. The problem is, of course, we did not have the emergency before the other appropriations bills went through. But I do believe that we can handle that situation and that the Senate may respond very positively. I have had very positive indications from Members that I have spoken to already today.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

In response to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY], if the provisions of the Agriculture appropriations bill prevail in the Senate, then these farmers will not be able to get crop insurance next year because they had a loss this year. So they will not be eligible for crop insurance. I quite agree, that would be the right way to go.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would just say that crop insurance is not a program that I think any of us have any confidence in. It cries out for reform.

One of the great problems that we will confront in this disaster bill is there will be no coverage for farmers who were prevented from planting.

My point is, in creating this disaster emergency fund that regardless whether it is crop damage or inner-city damage or damage to public works projects, we should start budgeting annually for these kinds of disasters, because we see them every year. I think that ought to be a normal appropriations process. That is why I think the gentleman's amendment should be made in order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen.

I would also point out that if, as the gentleman from Indiana makes the case, the fact is that it makes it even more of a case that we are going to need some of this money next year, and the question is whether or not we are going to prepare for that contingency now.

All I am seeking to do is offer an amendment. All I am doing is seeking to offer an amendment that will allow us to do it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman that the normal process for dealing with these disasters is, of course, a supplemental appropriations bill. I am sure the President intends to ask for that.

Second, I would point out to the gentleman that this bill, after the actions of the House today and after the actions of our committee, has been cut \$932,219,000 below the President's budget already. If we were to take an additional 1 percent out of this bill, it would go over \$1 billion that we will have taken away from these agencies.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The point is that we are going to have to do it on some of the other bills, too. It is not just directed at his bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Just let me respond to what the chairman said. I am aware, the President has sent up his proposal for the supplemental. The President's supplemental only calls for spending for 1993. And in his letter, Leon Panetta makes it clear that this is necessarily preliminary, and they are going to be seeking more in the future.

All I am suggesting is that if there is going to be more needed for the future, maybe we ought to get away from this idea of adding on to the deficit and maybe we ought to begin to prepare now.

We can, in fact, prepare now by beginning a process of setting aside some money. That is all I would seek to do.

The gentleman from Illinois wanted to cooperate with me offering this amendment. It was the gentleman from Kentucky who said we could not offer this amendment. I regret that, because it seems to me that the way to go here would be to have this amendment on the floor and see whether the House chooses to go the route of deficit add on each time we have an emergency or setting aside some money for emergency.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to quarrel with what the gentleman is trying to do. My concern is, all but four bills are already in the Senate.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I just explained that. In fact, I believe that the Senate will respond. If this House shows a determination to move in this direction, I believe there are Members in the Senate who will respond and we will have on the other bills a conferencable item that hopefully the committee would take up.

So we are going to have to have some cooperation from the Senate. Obviously, if the Senate does not cooperate, this is something that we could drop at that point. But for right now, it would be an important way of saying to the Senate, here is a way of moving ahead.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I have noted in the past 24 hours in the House that funding could have been made for the Midwest bill out of the flooding situation as follows: Yesterday, we voted on the possibility of cutting \$174 million from the National Endowment for the Arts. We spent \$3 million on the Presidio. The Interior bill contains \$450,000 for a bike path in Northern Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri just said 1 percent is only \$100 million. That is \$277 million.

We checked with the relief agency yesterday. That \$277 million that we could save today will do as follows: It will buy 14 million meals. It will house 400,000 people for a period of time for several months until the waters go down. It will also provide for at least 400 emergency food centers to be opened up along the Mississippi River. In the past 24 hours, we could have taken care of a good portion of the flood relief. Instead, we are spending it on items that have nothing to do with the function of the Federal Government.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the point being here, though, what we are attempting to do with this money is simply to have this 1 percent that would be set aside for preparation for next year. I realize that is not going to get to the immediate emergency. The President is responding to the immediate emergency. I congratulate him for that.

□ 1630

This House has some degree of responsibility, it seems to me, to think ahead and look out for the future. That is all we are attempting to do with this particular amendment.

Mr. YATES. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the reason I am reclaiming my time is to tell the gentleman that obviously his course of action depends upon whether the motion to rise is defeated. I propose now to go toward that motion to rise so that the House can exercise its will on that motion to rise.

I do not want to cut anybody off, but I would think we have debated this bill enough, really.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HANCOCK. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I represent Missouri's Seventh Congressional District. While we have been spared the worst of the flood damage in the present crisis, seven of the counties in my district have been designated for disaster relief.

As much as I want to make sure that the people of my district are taken care of, I do not see why such disaster relief must always add to the Federal deficit.

Like a family or business, the Federal Government should have a contingency fund for such disasters; a rainy day fund, if you will.

We have created FEMA and the SBA disaster loan program. We should budget the necessary funds, in advance. By creating a revolving disaster loan fund now, we can avoid the need for emergency, budget-busting appropriations down the road, which often serve as an excuse to avoid deficit targets.

We know disasters will come. In fact, history tells us we will have at least one major disaster a year. In 1990, we had the California earthquake. In 1991, we had Hurricane Hugo. In 1992, Hurricane Andrew. And now, the floods of 1993.

It is just common sense that we prepare for these things in advance. That is why I support setting aside 1 percent of the Federal budget for such natural disasters. Such a plan will enable the Federal Government to respond more quickly and will avoid the higher deficits of unplanned appropriations.

Financial advisors try to educate individuals to set aside a portion of their income for emergencies. Why cannot the U.S. Congress follow this common-sense advice?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that we had a revolving fund with several billion in it to

take care of disasters. The Credit Reform Act abolished the fund and put the money into the general treasury. We just went through this a year ago. If the Members wanted to do this, they should not have voted for the Credit Reform Act. That is exactly what it did, was to abolish the fund that we had to take care of disasters.

We cannot go both ways. We already had it, and I was not for it. I did not vote for it. I think we ought to have a revolving fund, but the Members ought not to vote for abolishing a revolving fund and then complain about it afterward.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2520 and commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the excellent work that he and the other members of the subcommittee have done in crafting the bill that is before us today. Trying to balance competing demands for limited funds is an unenviable task in any year but is particularly difficult as the Congress works to meet the administration's deficit reduction challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the severe budgetary constraints and reduction in acquisition funds confronting the subcommittee in drafting the fiscal year 1994 interior appropriations bill. However, I would like to highlight an important land acquisition project in the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area [NRA] in Georgia that the subcommittee was not able to include in this year's bill.

The Hammett Tract, located in the Holcomb Bridge unit of the Chattahoochee River NRA, is a strategically important parcel of land that would, if acquired, provide the only legal public access to 175 acres of Federal park land in the Holcomb Bridge unit of the Chattahoochee River NRA. As this property is under intense development pressure, it is my hope and expectation that the National Park Service will give serious consideration to using existing funds to acquire the Hammett Tract is fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the consideration that Chairman Yates has always shown the Chattahoochee River NRA. Since its establishment in 1978 and urge the Members of this body to support the Interior Subcommittee's bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would note my opposition to the language in the House Interior Appropriations Committee report on H.R. 2520 that directs the Forest Service to create a separate independent law enforcement organization within the Forest Service. If the Forest Service were to implement this direction it could forever change, in a negative way, how the Forest Service interacts with the public. For years, I have consistently warned and opposed turning America's natural resource agencies into police agencies. It is important that our forest and park rangers remain resource stewards primarily and not a specialized police force.

This report language completely overturns the Forest Service's line officer organizational structure. Law enforcement employees would no longer report to forest supervisors or even regional foresters. If line officers lose their authority over law enforcement, they lose some of their ability to be effective land and resource managers.

I am aware of the assertions that the Forest Service has not rigorously pursued certain timber theft cases aggressively enough. Each instance of such event should be dealt with thoroughly and aggressively, rather than using such problem or shortfall as an excuse to create a new organizational structure. If there are certain forest supervisors who are not fulfilling their law enforcement responsibilities, this situation can and should be corrected on a case-by-case basis without a major reorganization of the Forest Service which takes away needed authority from the majority of forest supervisors who are doing a good job.

The Forest Service already is moving forward with needed reforms in its law enforcement program. The Forest Service has created a director of law enforcement in its Washington Headquarters, has directed the regional foresters to do an assessment of their law enforcement organizations and has established a timber theft task force, a new internal investigations unit, a new whistle blowing hot line and a new national system to track all law enforcement cases. We should permit such actions to crystallize before taking policy action to set up a new organization.

I agree with the Appropriations Committee on the need to hold the Forest Service accountable for its law enforcement actions but I do not endorse the committee's attempt to set up a specialized police force. The committee report language does not have the force of law and has not been endorsed by any of the authorizing committees that have jurisdiction over the Forest Service. The Forest Service should not establish the new law enforcement organization described in this language.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of striking the language included in H.R. 2520 to increase the Federal grazing fee by implementing a new formula and to abolish grazing advisory boards. This is only my second term in Congress and this is the third time that I have seen the Appropriations Committee attempt to address the sensitive issue of grazing fees in the Interior appropriations bill.

I think that most Members would agree that a reevaluation of the Federal grazing fee formula is in order. As cochair of the Congressional Beef Caucus I have been working with my friend, the gentlemen from Oregon, BOB SMITH, to try to develop a proposal that balances the need to protect rangeland resources, the taxpayer, and the livelihoods of thousands of family ranchers. This is a difficult task, but I believe that a solution can be found. However, I strongly oppose efforts to make a change as part of the appropriations process.

The Secretary of Interior recently completed a series of hearings in the West as part of his effort to develop a fair adjustment in the Federal grazing fee formula. The Secretary has not yet announced his proposal, but has indicated that the grazing fee formula will be changed and the fees will increase. We should give the administration the chance to make a proposal before we make an arbitrary increase in the fee.

In addition, a number of bills are pending in the House to address the grazing fee issue. These bills and the administration proposal should be considered by the proper authorizing committees.

Mr. Chairman, with increasing regularity the House of Representatives is confronted with issues in which the economy and the environment must be balanced. The choices are not easy. I do not believe that we should take a shortcut or a stab in the dark in addressing these issues. The process may be long and painful, but the grazing fee issue, like other resource issues, must be examined carefully and we must make a decision based on the best information available.

I urge my colleagues to support the removal of section 314 of H.R. 2520.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes to discuss the U.S. Forest Service's below-cost timber sale program and its importance for my State. The bill before us expresses the sense of Congress that the Forest Service issue rules for the phasing out of the below-cost program as soon as possible. If this program was eliminated, the losses would devastate dozens of New Hampshire towns, the environment in the White Mountain National Forest, and two of the State's top four industries.

The White Mountain National Forest takes up nearly the whole north-central part of the State of New Hampshire. Bordering the forest are many small towns with a large amount of their property tax base eaten up by the Federal land.

The Federal Government reimburses these towns for the use of their land to the tune of \$466,000 statewide. While this may not seem like a lot to many here in Washington, it is a significant amount to a small town of 1,000 people in rural New Hampshire.

The White Mountain National Forest also maintains one of the most comprehensive forest management programs in the country. The program is designed to meet the needs of the many different uses of the forest.

These needs include wildlife protection and habitat protection, trail maintenance and upkeep, and proper timber contract enforcement to guard against unauthorized cutting.

The below-cost program also contributes to the State's overall economy. New Hampshire's top industry is tourism, and No. 3 is timber harvesting. The proper management of the forest is a necessary part of maintaining the integrity of those two industries and the jobs they provide.

The State government has estimated that should the below-cost program be eliminated, the timber industry alone could lose 11 percent of its current business.

If the Forest Service is unable to continue proper management of the forest, including maintaining summer and winter trails, mountain huts, camping grounds, and bridge repair, the tourism industry will suffer as well. The forest and all its natural beauty is one of the top tourist destinations in New Hampshire.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, allow me to run through some numbers to further make my point. In New Hampshire alone, the below-cost timber sale program creates 438 jobs, and that number is over 22,000 nationally. The economic activity generated in the State exceeds \$20 million, and the resulting Federal tax revenues are \$123 million nationwide.

Mr. Chairman, simply eliminating the below-cost program without looking at the economic and environmental benefits it provides is simply shortsighted.

There are nearly 65 national forests at risk if the program is eliminated. This may save the Government some money and make the bottom line look better, but the lost revenues, jobs, and environmental benefits will come back to haunt us all if this program is eliminated.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the elimination of this vital program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise and report the bill back to the House offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 177, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—243

Abercrombie	de la Garza	Hilliard
Ackerman	de Lugo (VI)	Hinchey
Andrews (ME)	Deal	Hoagland
Andrews (TX)	DeFazio	Hochbrueckner
Applegate	DeLauro	Holden
Bacchus (FL)	Dellums	Hoyer
Baessler	Derrick	Hughes
Barca	Deutsch	Inslee
Barclay	Dicks	Jacobs
Barlow	Dingell	Jefferson
Barrett (WI)	Dixon	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	Dooley	Johnson (SD)
Beilenson	Durbin	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Edwards (CA)	Johnston
Bilbray	Edwards (TX)	Kanjorski
Bishop	Engel	Kaptur
Blackwell	English (AZ)	Kennedy
Bonior	English (OK)	Kennelly
Borski	Eshoo	Kildee
Boucher	Evans	Klein
Brewster	Farr	Klink
Brooks	Fazio	Kopetski
Browder	Fields (LA)	Kreidler
Brown (CA)	Filner	LaFalce
Brown (FL)	Fingerhut	Lambert
Brown (OH)	Flake	Lancaster
Bryant	Foglietta	Lantos
Byrne	Ford (MI)	LaRocco
Cantwell	Ford (TN)	Laughlin
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Levin
Carr	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Chapman	Furse	Lipinski
Clay	Gedjenson	Lloyd
Clayton	Gephardt	Long
Clement	Geren	Lowey
Clyburn	Gibbons	Maloney
Collins (IL)	Glickman	Mann
Collins (MI)	Gonzalez	Manton
Condit	Gordon	Margolies
Cooper	Green	Mezvisky
Coppersmith	Gutierrez	Markey
Costello	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Coyne	Hamburg	Matsui
Cramer	Harman	Mazzoli
Danner	Hayes	McCloskey
Darden	Hefner	McCurdy

McDermott	Pickett	Stenholm
McHale	Pickle	Stokes
McNulty	Pomeroy	Strickland
Meehan	Poshard	Studds
Meek	Price (NC)	Stupak
Menendez	Rahall	Sundquist
Mfume	Rangel	Swett
Miller (CA)	Reed	Swift
Mineta	Reynolds	Synar
Minge	Richardson	Tanner
Mink	Romero-Barcelo	Tejeda
Moakley	(PR)	Thompson
Mollohan	Rose	Thornton
Montgomery	Rostenkowski	Thurman
Moran	Rowland	Torricelli
Murphy	Roybal-Allard	Trafficant
Murtha	Rush	Tucker
Natcher	Sabo	Underwood (GU)
Neal (MA)	Sanders	Unsoeld
Neal (NC)	Sangmeister	Valentine
Norton (DC)	Sawyer	Velazquez
Oberstar	Schenck	Vento
Obey	Schroeder	Visclosky
Olver	Schumer	Volkmer
Ortiz	Scott	Waters
Orton	Serrano	Watt
Owens	Sharp	Wheat
Pallone	Shepherd	Whitten
Parker	Sisisky	Williams
Pastor	Skaggs	Wilson
Payne (NJ)	Skelton	Wise
Payne (VA)	Slatery	Woolsey
Pelosi	Slaughter	Wyden
Penny	Smith (IA)	Wynn
Peterson (FL)	Spratt	Yates
Peterson (MN)	Stark	

NOES—177

Allard	Gilman	Mica
Archer	Goodlatte	Michel
Armey	Goodling	Miller (FL)
Bachus (AL)	Goss	Molinar
Baker (CA)	Grams	Moorhead
Baker (LA)	Grandy	Morella
Ballenger	Greenwood	Myers
Barrett (NE)	Gunderson	Nussle
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Oxley
Barton	Hamilton	Paxon
Bateman	Hancock	Petri
Bentley	Hansen	Pombo
Bereuter	Hastert	Porter
Billirakis	Hefley	Portman
Bliley	Herger	Pryce (OH)
Blute	Hobson	Quillen
Boehlert	Hoekstra	Quinn
Boehner	Hoke	Ravenel
Bonilla	Horn	Regula
Bunning	Houghton	Ridge
Burton	Huffington	Roberts
Buyer	Hunter	Roemer
Callahan	Hutchinson	Rogers
Calvert	Hutto	Rohrabacher
Camp	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Canady	Inglis	Roth
Castle	Inhofe	Roukema
Clinger	Istook	Royce
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Santorum
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Combest	Kasich	Schaefer
Cox	Kim	Schiff
Crane	King	Sensenbrenner
Crapo	Kingston	Shaw
Cunningham	Klecza	Shays
DeLay	Klug	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Skeen
Dickey	Kyl	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Dornan	Leach	Smith (OR)
Dreier	Levy	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Snowe
Dunn	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Emerson	Lightfoot	Spence
Everett	Linder	Stearns
Ewing	Livingston	Stump
Fawell	Machtley	Talent
Fields (TX)	Manzullo	Tauzin
Fish	McCandless	Taylor (MS)
Fowler	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Franks (CT)	McCrery	Thomas (CA)
Franks (NJ)	McDade	Thomas (WY)
Galleghy	McHugh	Torkildsen
Gallo	McInnis	Upton
Gekas	McKeon	Vucanovich
Gilchrist	McMillan	Walker
Gillmor	Meyers	Walsh

Weldon	Young (AK)	Zeliff
Wolf	Young (FL)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews (NJ)	Hastings	Ramstad
Bevill	Henry	Sarpalius
Coleman	Kolbe	Torres
Conyers	Lehman	Towns
Faleomavaega	McKinney	Washington
(AS)	Nadler	Waxman
Gingrich	Packard	

□ 1651

Mr. TEJEDA and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to rise and report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request separate votes on the so-called Sharp-Klug-Swett-Upton amendment, the so-called Walker-Penny-Brown amendment, and the so-called Stearns amendment that successfully passed the House.

TRIBUTE TO FALLEN HEROES

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this opportunity to inform the House of a terrible tragedy that occurred yesterday. The U.S. Customs Service lost four people when the helicopter in which they were flying crashed in a rural area in Georgia.

There were four persons onboard, three Customs crewmen and a special agent from the Georgia Bureau of Investigations. They were identified as Customs pilot, Rick Talfous, age 40, of Ponte Vedra Beach, FL; Alan Klumpp, age 32, of Jacksonville, FL; criminal investigator, David DeLoach, age 31, of Jacksonville, FL; and Georgia Bureau of Investigations special agent, Les DeLoach, age 29, of Claxton, GA.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, freedom and its defense, at times demands a heavy sacrifice. There is no doubt in my mind that these men died in the service of their fellow citizens, trying to make our society better, safer, and freer than today.

These agents, along with their brother and sister agents in law enforcement, risked their lives day in and day out in the performance of their duties. They were on an investigation when the accident occurred—and they paid the supreme price in the service of their country.

I know that all of the Members of this House join me in extending our sadness at this great loss to the families of these brave men and our prayers that the Lord will give them strength during this trying time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the Speaker, the Chair would ask the Members to observe a moment of silence in memory of these outstanding servants. The Members will please rise.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear the gentleman from New York when he made his request. I would request a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that dealt with pages 60 and 61 of the bill. I am not sure if the gentleman requested a vote on that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That vote has already been demanded. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 60, line 3, strike "\$438,163,000" and insert "\$433,163,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that votes on subsequent amendments, if ordered, will be reduced to a minimum of 5 minutes according to rule XV. This is a 15-minute vote which may be followed by two more 5-minute votes and a vote on final passage. Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 380, noes 37, not voting 17, as follows:

(Roll No. 336)

AYES—380

Abercrombie	Bacchus (FL)	Barrett (WI)
Ackerman	Bachus (AL)	Bartlett
Allard	Baessler	Barton
Andrews (ME)	Baker (LA)	Bateman
Andrews (NJ)	Ballenger	Becerra
Andrews (TX)	Barca	Beilenson
Applegate	Barcia	Bentley
Archer	Barlow	Bereuter
Army	Barrett (NE)	Berman

Bilbray	Furse	Manzullo
Bilirakis	Gallegly	Margolies-
Bishop	Gallo	Mezvinsky
Blackwell	Gejdenson	Markley
Bliley	Gekas	Martinez
Blute	Gephardt	Matsui
Boehlert	Geren	Mazzoli
Boehner	Gibbons	McCandless
Bonilla	Gilchrest	McCloskey
Bonior	Gillmor	McCollum
Borski	Gingrich	McCurdy
Boucher	Glickman	McDermott
Brewster	Goodlatte	McHale
Browder	Goodling	McHugh
Brown (CA)	Gordon	McInnis
Brown (FL)	Goss	McKeon
Brown (OH)	Grams	McMillan
Bryant	Grandy	McNulty
Bunning	Green	Meehan
Burton	Greenwood	Meek
Byrne	Gunderson	Menendez
Callahan	Gutierrez	Meyers
Calvert	Hall (OH)	Mfume
Camp	Hamburg	Mica
Canady	Hamilton	Miller (CA)
Cantwell	Hancock	Miller (FL)
Cardin	Harman	Mineta
Castle	Hastert	Minge
Clay	Hefner	Mink
Clayton	Heger	Moakley
Clement	Hilliard	Molinar
Clyburn	Hinchey	Montgomery
Coble	Hoagland	Moorhead
Collins (GA)	Hobson	Moran
Collins (IL)	Hochbrueckner	Morella
Collins (MI)	Hoekstra	Murphy
Combest	Hoke	Murtha
Condit	Holden	Natcher
Cooper	Horn	Neal (MA)
Coppersmith	Houghton	Neal (NC)
Costello	Hoyer	Nussle
Cox	Huffington	Oberstar
Coyne	Hughes	Obey
Cramer	Hutchinson	Oliver
Crane	Hutto	Ortiz
Crapo	Hyde	Owens
Cunningham	Inglis	Oxley
Danner	Inhofe	Pallone
Darden	Inslee	Parker
de la Garza	Istook	Pastor
Deal	Jacobs	Paxon
DeFazio	Jefferson	Payne (NJ)
DeLauro	Johnson (GA)	Payne (VA)
DeLay	Johnson (SD)	Pelosi
Dellums	Johnson, E.B.	Penny
Derrick	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (FL)
Deutsch	Johnston	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski	Petri
Dickey	Kaptur	Pickle
Dicks	Kasich	Pombo
Dingell	Kennedy	Pomeroy
Dixon	Kennelly	Porter
Dooley	Kildee	Portman
Doolittle	Kim	Poshard
Dornan	King	Price (NC)
Dreier	Kingston	Pryce (OH)
Duncan	Klecza	Quinn
Dunn	Klein	Rahall
Durbin	Klink	Ramstad
Edwards (CA)	Klug	Rangel
Edwards (TX)	Knollenberg	Ravenel
Emerson	Kopetski	Reed
Engel	Kreidler	Reynolds
English (AZ)	Kyl	Richardson
English (OK)	LaFalce	Roberts
Eshoo	Lambert	Roemer
Evans	Lancaster	Rogers
Everett	Lantos	Rohrabacher
Ewing	LaRocco	Ros-Lehtinen
Farr	Laughlin	Rose
Fawell	Lazio	Rostenkowski
Fazio	Leach	Roth
Fields (LA)	Levin	Roukema
Fields (TX)	Levy	Rowland
Filner	Lewis (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Fingerhut	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Fish	Linder	Rush
Flake	Lipinski	Sabo
Foglietta	Livingston	Sanders
Ford (MI)	Lloyd	Sangmeister
Ford (TN)	Long	Santorum
Fowler	Lowey	Sawyer
Frank (MA)	Machtley	Saxton
Franks (CT)	Maloney	Schaefer
Franks (NJ)	Mann	Schenk
Frost	Manton	Schiff

Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence

Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Tucker

Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote, and it may be followed by another five-minute vote and a vote on final passage. Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 278, noes 137, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

AYES—278

Baker (CA)
Brooks
Carr
Chapman
Gilman
Gonzalez
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hayes
Hefley
Hunter
Johnson (CT)
Lewis (CA)

Lightfoot
McCrery
McDade
Michel
Mollohan
Myers
Orton
Pickett
Quillen
Regula
Ridge
Smith (IA)
Smith (OR)

Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Thomas (WY)
Torricelli
Traficant
Vucanovich
Whitten
Williams
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—17

Bevill
Buyer
Clinger
Coleman
Conyers
Hastings

Henry
Kolbe
Lehman
McKinney
Nadler
Packard

Sarpallus
Torres
Towns
Washington
Waxman

□ 1714

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nadler for, with Mr. Kolbe against.
Mr. Waxman for, with Mr. Packard against.

Mr. DERRICK changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 61, line 23, strike "\$19,366,000" and insert "\$18,091,000".
Page 66, after line 22, insert the following:

REVISION OF AMOUNTS FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The amounts otherwise provided by this title for the Department of Energy are revised by reducing the amount made available under the heading "Fossil Energy Research and Development" by, and also transferring from the remaining amount made available under such heading to the appropriation for "Energy Conservation" an additional, \$24,873,000.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beffenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehert
Bonilla
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Coppersmith
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
English (OK)

Eshoo
Everett
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrist
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hancock
Harman
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchee
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Ingalls
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster

Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Livingston
Lloyd
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manzullo
Markey
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinar
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sanders

Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon

Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Tucker

Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Weldon
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—137

Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hilliard
Hobson
Holden
Hoyer
Hyde
Jefferson
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kleczka
Klink
Kopetski
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Long
Lowey
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Martinez
Matsui
Mazoli
McCloskey
McDade
McHale
McMillan
Meek
Mica
Michel
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Oberstar
Obey
Owens

Oxley
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pickett
Porter
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Ridge
Rogers
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Sabo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sawyer
Schenk
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stokes
Strickland
Sundquist
Swift
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Torricelli
Traficant
Visclosky
Washington
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—19

Bevill
Carr
Coleman
Conyers
Gephardt
Hastings
Henry

Hunter
Kolbe
Lehman
McInnis
McKinney
Nadler
Packard

Pomeroy
Sarpallus
Torres
Towns
Waxman

□ 1724

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the final amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 78, line 14, strike "\$144,451,000" and insert "\$137,228,450".
Page 78, line 22, strike "\$30,142,000" and insert "\$28,634,900".

Mr. SOLOMON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote which will be followed by a vote on final passage. Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 174, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

AYES—244

Allard	Edwards (TX)	Klug
Andrews (TX)	Emerson	Knollenberg
Applegate	English (OK)	Kyl
Archer	Everett	Lambert
Army	Ewing	Laughlin
Bacchus (FL)	Fawell	Lazio
Bachus (AL)	Fields (TX)	Levy
Baker (CA)	Fingerhut	Lewis (FL)
Baker (LA)	Fish	Lightfoot
Ballenger	Fowler	Linder
Barcia	Franks (CT)	Lipinski
Barlow	Franks (NJ)	Livingston
Barrett (NE)	Frost	Lloyd
Bartlett	Gallely	Long
Barton	Gallo	Machtley
Bateman	Gekas	Manzullo
Bentley	Geren	Margolies-
Bereuter	Gibbons	Mezvinsky
Billakis	Gilchrest	Martinez
Bliley	Gillmor	McCandless
Blute	Gingrich	McCloskey
Boehlert	Goodlatte	McCollum
Boehner	Goodling	McCrery
Bonilla	Gordon	McCurdy
Brewster	Goss	McDade
Browder	Grams	McHale
Brown (OH)	Grandy	McHugh
Bunning	Greenwood	McInnis
Burton	Gunderson	McKeon
Buyer	Hall (TX)	McMillan
Callahan	Hamilton	McNulty
Calvert	Hancock	Meyers
Camp	Hansen	Mica
Canady	Hastert	Michel
Cantwell	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Chapman	Hefley	Minge
Coble	Henger	Molinari
Collins (GA)	Hoagland	Montgomery
Combest	Hobson	Moorhead
Condit	Hoekstra	Murphy
Cooper	Hoke	Myers
Costello	Holden	Neal (NC)
Cox	Huffington	Nussle
Cramer	Hutchinson	Ortiz
Crane	Hutto	Orton
Crapo	Hyde	Oxley
Cunningham	Inglis	Parker
de la Garza	Inhofe	Paxon
Deal	Inslee	Payne (VA)
DeFazio	Istook	Penny
DeLay	Jacobs	Peterson (MN)
Derrick	Johnson (CT)	Petri
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)	Pickett
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Pombo
Dooley	Kanjorski	Porter
Doolittle	Kaptur	Portman
Dornan	Kasich	Poshard
Dreier	Kim	Pryce (OH)
Duncan	King	Quillen
Dunn	Kingston	Quinn

Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays

Shuster
Siskiy
Skeltan
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Trafiacant
Upton
Valentine
Visclosky
Volkmner
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—174

Abercrombie	Gilman	Oberstar
Ackerman	Glickman	Obey
Andrews (ME)	Gonzalez	Oliver
Andrews (NJ)	Green	Owens
Baessler	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barca	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hamburg	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Harman	Pelosi
Bellenson	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hilliard	Pickle
Bilbray	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Bishop	Hochbrueckner	Price (NC)
Blackwell	Horn	Rangel
Bonior	Houghton	Reed
Borski	Hoyer	Reynolds
Boucher	Hughes	Richardson
Brooks	Jefferson	Rose
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Rostenkowski
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E.B.	Roybal-Allard
Bryant	Johnston	Rush
Byrne	Kennedy	Sabo
Cardin	Kennelly	Sanders
Carr	Kildee	Sangmeister
Castle	Kieccka	Sawyer
Clay	Klein	Schenk
Clayton	Klink	Schumer
Clement	Kopetski	Scott
Clinger	Kreidler	Serrano
Clyburn	LaFalce	Sharp
Collins (IL)	Lancaster	Shepherd
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Skaggs
Coppersmith	LaRocco	Skeen
Coyne	Leach	Slaughter
Danner	Levin	Smith (IA)
Darden	Lewis (CA)	Stark
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dellums	Lowey	Strickland
Deutsch	Maloney	Studds
Dicks	Mann	Stupak
Dingell	Manton	Swift
Dixon	Markey	Synar
Durbin	Matsui	Tejeda
Edwards (CA)	Mazzoli	Thompson
Engel	McDermott	Torricelli
English (AZ)	Meehan	Tucker
Eshoo	Meek	Unsoeld
Evans	Menendez	Velazquez
Farr	Mfume	Vento
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Washington
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Waters
Flner	Mink	Watt
Flake	Moakley	Whit
Foglietta	Mollohan	Whitten
Ford (MI)	Moran	Williams
Ford (TN)	Morella	Wilson
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Woolsey
Furse	Natcher	Wyden
Gejdenson	Neal (MA)	Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Bevill	Hunter	Sarpalius
Coleman	Kolbe	Torres
Conyers	Lehman	Towns
Gephardt	McKinney	Waxman
Hastings	Nadler	
Henry	Packard	

□ 1730

The Clerk announced the following pair:
On this vote:

Mr. Kolbe for, with Ms. McKinney against.

Mr. Berman changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2520 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section the following new section:

Section . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except for the amount provided under "Miscellaneous payments to Indians", Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; "Salaries and Expenses", National Indian Gaming Commission, Department of the Interior; "Payment to the Institute", Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development; "Salaries and expenses", Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars; "Salaries and expenses" and "National capital arts and cultural affairs", Commission on Fine Arts; "Salaries and expenses", Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; "Salaries and expenses", National Capitol Planning Commission; "Salaries and expenses", Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission; and "Salaries and expenses" and "Public development", Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and Holocaust Memorial Construction each amount appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by / per centum: *Provided*, That such reductions shall be applied ratably to each account, program, activity, and project provided for in this Act.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman's motion to recommit contain by any chance the proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it does not.

Mr. Speaker, this is a 1 percent cut, which exempts some of the very small programs in the bill. This is a good bill, but it is one-half billion dollars presently over last year's level. We are led to believe that this year we are cutting spending. We are really not.

Considering this bill and all of the 10 appropriation bills that have been passed this far, we are about \$26.75 billion above last year's level. We are below the President's request and below our 602(b) allocation, but if we are serious about cutting spending, this is the way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very minimal reduction, 1 percent. It takes us down to last year's level, and I think all of us can vote for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, this, in my friend's words, may be a minimum amendment, but it will have a maximum effect, because this bill has already been cut by action of our committee and by action of the House by close to \$1 billion. The exact amount is \$930 million.

I will say to the House that agencies cannot afford another cut of this type. I would hope and request that the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] be defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 278, noes 138, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—278

Abercrombie	Blute	Clyburn
Ackerman	Bonior	Collins (IL)
Allard	Borski	Collins (MI)
Andrews (ME)	Boucher	Cooper
Andrews (TX)	Brewster	Coppersmith
Applegate	Brooks	Costello
Bacchus (FL)	Browder	Coyne
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Cramer
Barlow	Brown (FL)	Danner
Barrett (WI)	Brown (OH)	Darden
Bateman	Bryant	de la Garza
Becerra	Byrne	Deal
Bellenson	Calvert	DeFazio
Bentley	Cantwell	DeLauro
Bereuter	Cardin	Dellums
Berman	Carr	Derrick
Bilbray	Chapman	Deutsch
Bilirakis	Clay	Diaz-Balart
Bishop	Clayton	Dicks
Blackwell	Clement	Dingell
Bliley	Clinger	Dixon

Dooley	Lancaster	Regula	Hyde	Michel	Sensenbrenner
Durbin	Lantos	Reynolds	Inglis	Miller (FL)	Shaw
Edwards (CA)	LaRocco	Richardson	Inhofe	Minge	Shuster
Edwards (TX)	Laughlin	Roemer	Istook	Moorhead	Skelton
Engel	Lazio	Rogers	Jacobs	Myers	Smith (MI)
English (AZ)	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen	Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Smith (OR)
English (OK)	Levin	Rose	Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Smith (TX)
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Rostenkowski	Kasich	Paxon	Snowe
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Rowland	Kim	Penny	Solomon
Farr	Lightfoot	Roybal-Allard	King	Peterson (MN)	Spence
Fazio	Lipinski	Rush	Kingston	Petri	Stearns
Fields (LA)	Livingston	Sabo	Klug	Pickett	Stenholm
Filner	Lloyd	Sanders	Knollenberg	Pombo	Stump
Fingerhut	Long	Sangmeister	Kyl	Portman	Sundquist
Fish	Lowey	Sawyer	Levy	Pryce (OH)	Talent
Flake	Machtley	Schenk	Lewis (FL)	Quinn	Tauzin
Foglietta	Maloney	Schiff	Linder	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
Ford (MI)	Mann	Schroeder	Manzullo	Ridge	Thomas (CA)
Ford (TN)	Manton	Schumer	McCandless	Roberts	Upton
Fowler	Margolies-	Scott	McCollum	Rohrabacher	Walker
Frank (MA)	Mezvinsky	Serrano	McCrery	Roth	Weldon
Frost	Markey	Sharp	McHugh	Royce	Whitten
Furse	Martinez	Shays	McInnis	Santorum	Wolf
Gallo	Matsui	Shepherd	McKeon	Saxton	Zeliff
Gejdenson	Mazzoli	Sisisky	Mica	Schaefer	Zimmer
Gephardt	McCloskey	Skaggs			
Gibbons	McCurdy	Skeen			
Gilchrest	McDade	Slattery			
Gilman	McDermott	Slaughter			
Glickman	McHale	Smith (IA)			
Gonzalez	McMillan	Smith (NJ)			
Gordon	McNulty	Spratt			
Green	Meehan	Stark			
Gunderson	Meek	Stokes			
Gutierrez	Menendez	Strickland			
Hall (OH)	Meyers	Studds			
Hall (TX)	Mfume	Stupak			
Hamburg	Mineta	Swett			
Hamilton	Mink	Swift			
Hansen	Moakley	Synar			
Harman	Molinar	Tanner			
Hefner	Mollohan	Taylor (NC)			
Herger	Montgomery	Tejeda			
Hilliard	Moran	Thomas (WY)			
Hinchey	Morella	Thompson			
Hoagland	Murtha	Thornton			
Hobson	Natcher	Thurman			
Hochbrueckner	Neal (MA)	Torkildsen			
Holden	Neal (NC)	Torricelli			
Horn	Oberstar	Trafficant			
Houghton	Obey	Tucker			
Hoyer	Olver	Unsoeld			
Hughes	Ortiz	Valentine			
Hutchinson	Orton	Velazquez			
Inslee	Owens	Vento			
Jefferson	Pallone	Visclosky			
Johnson (GA)	Parker	Volkmer			
Johnson (SD)	Pastor	Vucanovich			
Johnson, E.B.	Payne (NJ)	Walsh			
Johnston	Payne (VA)	Washington			
Kanjorski	Pelosi	Waters			
Kaptur	Peterson (FL)	Watt			
Kennedy	Pickle	Wheat			
Kennelly	Pomeroy	Williams			
Kildee	Porter	Wilson			
Kleczka	Poshard	Wise			
Klein	Price (NC)	Woolsey			
Klink	Quillen	Wyden			
Kopetski	Rahall	Wynn			
Kreidler	Rangel	Yates			
LaFalce	Ravenel	Young (AK)			
Lambert	Reed	Young (FL)			

NOES—138

Andrews (NJ)	Castle	Franks (CT)
Archer	Coble	Franks (NJ)
Armedy	Collins (GA)	Gallely
Bachus (AL)	Combest	Gekas
Baker (CA)	Condit	Geren
Baker (LA)	Cox	Gingrich
Ballenger	Crane	Goodlatte
Barca	Crapo	Goodling
Barcia	Cunningham	Goss
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Grams
Bartlett	Dickey	Grandy
Barton	Doolittle	Greenwood
Boehert	Dornan	Hancock
Boehner	Dreier	Hastert
Bonilla	Duncan	Hayes
Bunning	Dunn	Hefley
Burton	Emerson	Hoekstra
Buyer	Everett	Hoke
Callahan	Ewing	Huffington
Camp	Fawell	Hunter
Canady	Fields (TX)	Hutto

Bevill	Kolbe	Packard
Coleman	Lehman	Roukema
Conyers	McKinney	Sarpallius
Gillmor	Miller (CA)	Torres
Hastings	Murphy	Towns
Henry	Nadler	Waxman

NOT VOTING—18

□ 1750

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, due to a prior official commitment, I was unable to be present for the vote on roll-call No. 339.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House of my absence for part of the debate on H.R. 2520, the fiscal year 1994 Interior appropriations bill.

Consideration of H.R. 2520 was originally scheduled to be completed before today. As a result of numerous House scheduling changes, however, debate on the bill unexpectedly continued into today. Regrettably, I had already committed to participating in an important NAFTA related conference in San Antonio today.

The conference was held to develop strategies to address critical United States/Mexico border infrastructure needs on the environment, housing, energy, and transportation. It was attended by key private sector entities and top government officials, including the U.S. Secretaries of Commerce, HUD, Energy, and Transportation, the EPA Administrator and many of their counterparts from Mexico, among others.

The conference is a key component of the President's plan to develop an assistance package for the border. Border infrastructure issues are of vital importance in southern Arizona. This was an important opportunity to continue working with the President to develop plans to meet the border infrastructure needs in Arizona and other border States.

Had I been present for consideration of H.R. 2520, I would have voted aye on the following

votes: rollcall numbers 330, 331, 333, 334, 337, 338, and 339. I would have voted nay on the following votes: rollcall numbers 335 and 336. I made advance preparations to pair my votes with opposite voting members so as to minimize the impact of my absence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the following rollcall votes, I would have voted yes on rollcall votes numbered 330, 333, 338, and 339.

I would have voted no on rollcall votes numbered 331, 332, 334, 335, 336, and 337.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2520, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2520, the Clerk shall be authorized to make any necessary technical corrections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 208, DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider in the House a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 208) disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment, or most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China; that all points of order against the resolution and its consideration be waived; that the joint resolution be debated for 1 hour, to be equally divided and from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] or his designee; that pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question be considered as ordered to final passage without intervening motion; and that the provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, shall not apply to any other joint resolution of the 103d Congress disapproving the extension recommended by the President on May 28, 1993, of most-favored-nation treatment to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not

object, on my reservation, as the author of the resolution which would disapprove the extension of most-favored-nation treatment of trade with the People's Republic of China, I take this reservation to indicate my support for the chairman's request.

The purpose of this unanimous consent request is to reduce from 20 hours to 1 hour the debate on my disapproval resolution without having to go the Committee on Rules to make that procedural change.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman on reporting the resolution, though I would have preferred a favorable rather than adverse report. I urge my colleagues to support my resolution of disapproval when it is called up next week.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of asking the majority leader to enlighten us as to the schedule for next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, votes are finished today. There will not be votes on tomorrow.

On Monday, July 19, the House will meet at noon to consider five bills on suspension. Recorded votes will be postponed until Tuesday, July 20.

We will consider H.R. 2239, SEC Authorization; H.R. 1305, Minor Boundary Adjustments and Miscellaneous Park Amendments Act of 1993; H.R. 631, Colorado Wilderness Preservation Act of 1993; H.R. 1631, District of Columbia Justice Reform Act of 1993; H.R. 1632, To Remove Gender-Specific References in District of Columbia Code.

On Tuesday, July 20, the House will meet at noon to take up the Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations for fiscal year 1994, and the National and Community Service Act, under a modified open rule.

On Wednesday, July 21, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 10. We will be taking up a number of pieces of legislation: House Joint Resolution 208, disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China; H.R. 2490, Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 1994; a House resolution on disaster assistance sup-

plemental; H.R. 2200, the NASA Authorization Act for 1994; H.R. 2150, the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1993; H.R. 1340, the Resolution Trust Corporation Completion Act; H.R. 2530, the Bureau of Land Management authorization.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman. If I might just ask, to clarify, the gentleman, I believe, said there would be no votes on Monday. Any votes that were called would be laid over until Tuesday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to the majority leader, I would just call attention to the membership that the National and Community Service Act is scheduled for Tuesday. Our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] had previously asked Members to have their amendments prefiled at least by Monday, so they would be printed in the RECORD prior to consideration, which would take place on Tuesday.

I would remind the membership of that, and just ask the majority leader, for the purpose of planning, is there a likelihood of votes next Friday?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, I cannot say to the gentleman at this point whether or not we will have votes on Friday, for the reason that we have this disaster assistance supplemental that we have to get done next week. I am not sure exactly what day it can be brought up. We will make every effort to avoid having votes on Friday. That may be possible, but I cannot give him a concrete assurance at this point.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the majority leader. Just one more question, if I might. There was a resolution of inquiry on the so-called Travelgate matter. Is there any plan to bring that up at any time next week?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is my understanding that it must receive 3 days layover to receive minority views, and that period will not expire until next week. The bill may be brought up next week, or more likely, the week after.

Mr. SOLOMON. More likely the week after. I certainly do thank the majority leader, and I hope he has a nice weekend.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I wish the gentleman the same.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 19, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND
RESULTS ACT OF 1993

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 20) to provide for the establishment of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if this has been cleared.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. It is my understanding that it has, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] to offer an explanation of this bill.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, the House passed by voice vote H.R. 826, the House version of this legislation. S. 20, as amended and passed by the Senate, is virtually identical to the House bill. The only significant difference is a clarification in S. 20 of the responsibilities of the U.S. Postal Service. That language has been agreed to by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and his cooperation and assistance is greatly appreciated.

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 takes the first step toward the President's pledge to reinvest government. It would require Federal agencies to develop strategic plans, set performance goals, and report annually to Congress and the Office of Management and Budget the precise results that that program achieves.

After a series of pilot projects, the act will eventually be implemented Governmentwide, where all programs will be evaluated and budgeted based

on their performance. This legislation will give program managers the flexibility to achieve their goals in exchange for better accountability. It enjoys widespread bipartisan support, and is eagerly awaited by the President.

Mr. Speaker, there is a clarification that needs to be made in the report that was filed to accompany the House version of this bill, and I include that clarification for the RECORD.

□ 1800

Mr. CLINGER. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Oklahoma in support of this legislation.

As I have said many times before, the need is great for a Governmentwide performance measurement system tied to the appropriations process. The House has the rare opportunity today to approve legislation which has had support on both sides of the aisle from both bodies of Congress and from the President. This legislation will for the first time ask Federal program managers to prove the success and progress of their programs.

I appreciate the efforts of everyone involved in getting this legislation to the President for his signature, particularly the hard work of Senator WILLIAM ROTH in originally drafting this bill some years ago, and I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 20

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Performance and Results Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) waste and inefficiency in Federal programs undermine the confidence of the American people in the Government and reduces the Federal Government's ability to address adequately vital public needs;

(2) Federal managers are seriously disadvantaged in their efforts to improve program efficiency and effectiveness, because of insufficient articulation of program goals and inadequate information on program performance; and

(3) congressional policymaking, spending decisions and program oversight are seriously handicapped by insufficient attention to program performance and results.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) improve the confidence of the American people in the capability of the Federal Government, by systematically holding Federal agencies accountable for achieving program results;

(2) initiate program performance reform with a series of pilot projects in setting pro-

gram goals, measuring program performance against those goals, and reporting publicly on their progress;

(3) improve Federal program effectiveness and public accountability by promoting a new focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction;

(4) help Federal managers improve service delivery, by requiring that they plan for meeting program objectives and by providing them with information about program results and service quality;

(5) improve congressional decisionmaking by providing more objective information on achieving statutory objectives, and on the relative effectiveness and efficiency of Federal programs and spending; and

(6) improve internal management of the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. STRATEGIC PLANNING.

Chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 305 the following new section:

"§ 306. Strategic plans

"(a) No later than September 30, 1997, the head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and to the Congress a strategic plan for program activities. Such plan shall contain—

"(1) a comprehensive mission statement covering the major functions and operations of the agency;

"(2) general goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for the major functions and operations of the agency;

"(3) a description of how the goals and objectives are to be achieved, including a description of the operational processes, skills and technology, and the human, capital, information, and other resources required to meet those goals and objectives;

"(4) a description of how the performance goals included in the plan required by section 1115(a) of title 31 shall be related to the general goals and objectives in the strategic plan;

"(5) an identification of those key factors external to the agency and beyond its control that could significantly affect the achievement of the general goals and objectives; and

"(6) a description of the program evaluations used in establishing or revising general goals and objectives, with a schedule for future program evaluations.

"(b) The strategic plan shall cover a period of not less than five years forward from the fiscal year in which it is submitted, and shall be updated and revised at least every three years.

"(c) The performance plan required by section 1115 of title 31 shall be consistent with the agency's strategic plan. A performance plan may not be submitted for a fiscal year not covered by a current strategic plan under this section.

"(d) When developing a strategic plan, the agency shall consult with the Congress, and shall solicit and consider the views and suggestions of those entities potentially affected by or interested in such a plan.

"(e) The functions and activities of this section shall be considered to be inherently Governmental functions. The drafting of strategic plans under this section shall be performed only by Federal employees.

"(f) For purposes of this section the term 'agency' means an Executive agency defined under section 105, but does not include the Central Intelligence Agency, the General Accounting Office, the Panama Canal Commission, the United States Postal Service, and the Postal Rate Commission."

SEC. 4. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLANS AND REPORTS.

(a) BUDGET CONTENTS AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(29) beginning with fiscal year 1999, a Federal Government performance plan for the overall budget as provided for under section 1115."

(b) PERFORMANCE PLANS AND REPORTS.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1114 the following new sections:

"§ 1115. Performance plans

"(a) In carrying out the provisions of section 1105(a)(29), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall require each agency to prepare an annual performance plan covering each program activity set forth in the budget of such agency. Such plan shall—

"(1) establish performance goals to define the level of performance to be achieved by a program activity;

"(2) express such goals in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form unless authorized to be in an alternative form under subsection (b);

"(3) briefly describe the operational processes, skills and technology, and the human, capital, information, or other resources required to meet the performance goals;

"(4) establish performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the relevant outputs, service levels, and outcomes of each program activity;

"(5) provide a basis for comparing actual program results with the established performance goals; and

"(6) describe the means to be used to verify and validate measured values.

"(b) If an agency, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, determines that it is not feasible to express the performance goals for a particular program activity in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may authorize an alternative form. Such alternative form shall—

"(1) include separate descriptive statements of—

"(A)(i) a minimally effective program, and

"(ii) a successful program, or

"(B) such alternative as authorized by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget,

with sufficient precision and in such terms that would allow for an accurate, independent determination of whether the program activity's performance meets the criteria of the description; or

"(2) state why it is infeasible or impractical to express a performance goal in any form for the program activity.

"(c) For the purpose of complying with this section, an agency may aggregate, disaggregate, or consolidate program activities, except that any aggregation or consolidation may not omit or minimize the significance of any program activity constituting a major function or operation for the agency.

"(d) An agency may submit with its annual performance plan an appendix covering any portion of the plan that—

"(1) is specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy; and

"(2) is properly classified pursuant to such Executive order.

"(e) The functions and activities of this section shall be considered to be inherently

Governmental functions. The drafting of performance plans under this section shall be performed only by Federal employees.

"(f) For purposes of this section and sections 1116 through 1119, and sections 9703 and 9704 the term—

"(1) 'agency' has the same meaning as such term is defined under section 306(f) of title 5;

"(2) 'outcome measure' means an assessment of the results of a program activity compared to its intended purpose;

"(3) 'output measure' means the tabulation, calculation, or recording of activity or effort and can be expressed in a quantitative or qualitative manner;

"(4) 'performance goal' means a target level of performance expressed as a tangible, measurable objective, against which actual achievement can be compared, including a goal expressed as a quantitative standard, value, or rate;

"(5) 'performance indicator' means a particular value or characteristic used to measure output or outcome;

"(6) 'program activity' means a specific activity or project as listed in the program and financing schedules of the annual budget of the United States Government; and

"(7) 'program evaluation' means an assessment, through objective measurement and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which Federal programs achieve intended objectives.

"§ 1116. Program performance reports

"(a) No later than March 31, 2000, and no later than March 31 of each year thereafter, the head of each agency shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress, a report on program performance for the previous fiscal year.

"(b)(1) Each program performance report shall set forth the performance indicators established in the agency performance plan under section 1115, along with the actual program performance achieved compared with the performance goals expressed in the plan for that fiscal year.

"(2) If performance goals are specified in an alternative form under section 1115(b), the results of such program shall be described in relation to such specifications, including whether the performance failed to meet the criteria of a minimally effective or successful program.

"(c) The report for fiscal year 2000 shall include actual results for the preceding fiscal year, the report for fiscal year 2001 shall include actual results for the two preceding fiscal years, and the report for fiscal year 2002 and all subsequent reports shall include actual results for the three preceding fiscal years.

"(d) Each report shall—

"(1) review the success of achieving the performance goals of the fiscal year;

"(2) evaluate the performance plan for the current fiscal year relative to the performance achieved toward the performance goals in the fiscal year covered by the report;

"(3) explain and describe, where a performance goal has not been met (including when a program activity's performance is determined not to have met the criteria of a successful program activity under section 1115(b)(1)(A)(ii) or a corresponding level of achievement if another alternative form is used)—

"(A) why the goal was not met;

"(B) those plans and schedules for achieving the established performance goal; and

"(C) if the performance goal is impractical or infeasible, why that is the case and what action is recommended;

"(4) describe the use and assess the effectiveness in achieving performance goals of

any waiver under section 9703 of this title; and

"(5) include the summary findings of those program evaluations completed during the fiscal year covered by the report.

"(e) An agency head may include all program performance information required annually under this section in an annual financial statement required under section 3515 if any such statement is submitted to the Congress no later than March 31 of the applicable fiscal year.

"(f) The functions and activities of this section shall be considered to be inherently Governmental functions. The drafting of program performance reports under this section shall be performed only by Federal employees.

"§ 1117. Exemption

"The Director of the Office of Management and Budget may exempt from the requirements of sections 1115 and 1116 of this title and section 306 of title 5, any agency with annual outlays of \$20,000,000 or less."

SEC. 5. MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY.

(a) MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 9702, the following new section:

"§ 9703. Managerial accountability and flexibility

"(a) Beginning with fiscal year 1999, the performance plans required under section 1115 may include proposals to waive administrative procedural requirements and controls, including specification of personnel staffing levels, limitations on compensation or remuneration, and prohibitions or restrictions on funding transfers among budget object classification 20 and subclassifications 11, 12, 31, and 32 of each annual budget submitted under section 1105, in return for specific individual or organization accountability to achieve a performance goal. In preparing and submitting the performance plan under section 1105(a)(29), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review and may approve any proposed waivers. A waiver shall take effect at the beginning of the fiscal year for which the waiver is approved.

"(b) Any such proposal under subsection (a) shall describe the anticipated effects on performance resulting from greater managerial or organizational flexibility, discretion, and authority, and shall quantify the expected improvements in performance resulting from any waiver. The expected improvements shall be compared to current actual performance, and to the projected level of performance that would be achieved independent of any waiver.

"(c) Any proposal waiving limitations on compensation or remuneration shall precisely express the monetary change in compensation or remuneration amounts, such as bonuses or awards, that shall result from meeting, exceeding, or failing to meet performance goals.

"(d) Any proposed waiver of procedural requirements or controls imposed by an agency (other than the proposing agency or the Office of Management and Budget) may not be included in a performance plan unless it is endorsed by the agency that established the requirement, and the endorsement included in the proposing agency's performance plan.

"(e) A waiver shall be in effect for one or two years as specified by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in approving the waiver. A waiver may be renewed for a subsequent year. After a waiver has been in

effect for three consecutive years, the performance plan prepared under section 1115 may propose that a waiver, other than a waiver of limitations on compensation or remuneration, be made permanent.

"(f) For purposes of this section, the definitions under section 1115(f) shall apply."

SEC. 6. PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) PERFORMANCE PLANS AND REPORTS.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1117 (as added by section 4 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 1118. Pilot projects for performance goals

"(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the head of each agency, shall designate not less than ten agencies as pilot projects in performance measurement for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996. The selected agencies shall reflect a representative range of Government functions and capabilities in measuring and reporting program performance.

"(b) Pilot projects in the designated agencies shall undertake the preparation of performance plans under section 1115, and program performance reports under section 1116, other than section 1116(c), for one or more of the major functions and operations of the agency. A strategic plan shall be used when preparing agency performance plans during one or more years of the pilot period.

"(c) No later than May 1, 1997, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to the President and to the Congress which shall—

"(1) assess the benefits, costs, and usefulness of the plans and reports prepared by the pilot agencies in meeting the purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993;

"(2) identify any significant difficulties experienced by the pilot agencies in preparing plans and reports; and

"(3) set forth any recommended changes in the requirements of the provisions of Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, section 306 of title 5, sections 1105, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1119 and 9703 of this title, and this section."

(b) MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 9703 (as added by section 5 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 9704. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility

"(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall designate not less than five agencies as pilot projects in managerial accountability and flexibility for fiscal years 1995 and 1996. Such agencies shall be selected from those designated as pilot projects under section 1118 and shall reflect a representative range of Government functions and capabilities in measuring and reporting program performance.

"(b) Pilot projects in the designated agencies shall include proposed waivers in accordance with section 9703 for one or more of the major functions and operations of the agency.

"(c) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall include in the report to the President and to the Congress required under section 1118(c)—

"(1) an assessment of the benefits, costs, and usefulness of increasing managerial and organizational flexibility, discretion, and authority in exchange for improved performance through a waiver; and

"(2) an identification of any significant difficulties experienced by the pilot agencies in preparing proposed waivers.

"(d) For purposes of this section the definitions under section 1115(f) shall apply."

(c) PERFORMANCE BUDGETING.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1118 (as added by section 6 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 1119. Pilot projects for performance budgeting

"(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the head of each agency shall designate not less than five agencies as pilot projects in performance budgeting for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. At least three of the agencies shall be selected from those designated as pilot projects under section 1118, and shall also reflect a representative range of Government functions and capabilities in measuring and reporting program performance.

"(b) Pilot projects in the designated agencies shall cover the preparation of performance budgets. Such budgets shall present, for one or more of the major functions and operations of the agency, the varying levels of performance, including outcome-related performance, that would result from different budgeted amounts.

"(c) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall include, as an alternative budget presentation in the budget submitted under section 1105 for fiscal year 1999, the performance budgets of the designated agencies for this fiscal year.

"(d) No later than March 31, 2001, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall transmit a report to the President and to the Congress on the performance budgeting pilot projects which shall—

"(1) assess the feasibility and advisability of including a performance budget as part of the annual budget submitted under section 1105;

"(2) describe any difficulties encountered by the pilot agencies in preparing a performance budget;

"(3) recommend whether legislation requiring performance budgets should be proposed and the general provisions of any legislation; and

"(4) set forth any recommended changes in the other requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, section 306 of title 5, sections 1105, 1115, 1116, 1117, and 9703 of this title, and this section.

"(e) After receipt of the report required under subsection (d), the Congress may specify that a performance budget be submitted as part of the annual budget submitted under section 1105."

SEC. 7. UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE.

Part III of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 28—STRATEGIC PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

"Sec.

"2801. Definitions.

"2802. Strategic plans.

"2803. Performance plans.

"2804. Program performance reports.

"2805. Inherently Governmental functions.

"§ 2801. Definitions

"For purposes of this chapter the term—

"(1) 'outcome measure' refers to an assessment of the results of a program activity compared to its intended purpose;

"(2) 'output measure' refers to the tabulation, calculation, or recording of activity or effort and can be expressed in a quantitative or qualitative manner;

"(3) 'performance goal' means a target level of performance expressed as a tangible, measurable objective, against which actual

achievement shall be compared, including a goal expressed as a quantitative standard, value, or rate;

"(4) 'performance indicator' refers to a particular value or characteristic used to measure output or outcome;

"(5) 'program activity' means a specific activity related to the mission of the Postal Service; and

"(6) 'program evaluation' means an assessment, through objective measurement and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which Postal Service programs achieve intended objectives.

"§ 2802. Strategic plans

"(a) No later than September 30, 1997, the Postal Service shall submit to the President and the Congress a strategic plan for its program activities. Such plan shall contain—

"(1) a comprehensive mission statement covering the major functions and operations of the Postal Service;

"(2) general goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for the major functions and operations of the Postal Service;

"(3) a description of how the goals and objectives are to be achieved, including a description of the operational processes, skills and technology, and the human, capital, information, and other resources required to meet those goals and objectives;

"(4) a description of how the performance goals included in the plan required under section 2803 shall be related to the general goals and objectives in the strategic plan;

"(5) an identification of those key factors external to the Postal Service and beyond its control that could significantly affect the achievement of the general goals and objectives; and

"(6) a description of the program evaluations used in establishing or revising general goals and objectives, with a schedule for future program evaluations.

"(b) The strategic plan shall cover a period of not less than five years forward from the fiscal year in which it is submitted, and shall be updated and revised at least every three years.

"(c) The performance plan required under section 2803 shall be consistent with the Postal Service's strategic plan. A performance plan may not be submitted for a fiscal year not covered by a current strategic plan under this section.

"(d) When developing a strategic plan, the Postal Service shall solicit and consider the views and suggestions of those entities potentially affected by or interested in such a plan, and shall advise the Congress of the contents of the plan.

"§ 2803. Performance plans

"(a) The Postal Service shall prepare an annual performance plan covering each program activity set forth in the Postal Service budget, which shall be included in the comprehensive statement presented under section 2401(g) of this title. Such plan shall—

"(1) establish performance goals to define the level of performance to be achieved by a program activity;

"(2) express such goals in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form unless an alternative form is used under subsection (b);

"(3) briefly describe the operational processes, skills and technology, and the human, capital, information, or other resources required to meet the performance goals;

"(4) establish performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the relevant outputs, service levels, and outcomes of each program activity;

"(5) provide a basis for comparing actual program results with the established performance goals; and

"(6) describe the means to be used to verify and validate measured values.

"(b) If the Postal Service determines that it is not feasible to express the performance goals for a particular program activity in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form, the Postal Service may use an alternative form. Such alternative form shall—

"(1) include separate descriptive statements of—

"(A) a minimally effective program, and

"(B) a successful program,

with sufficient precision and in such terms that would allow for an accurate, independent determination of whether the program activity's performance meets the criteria of either description; or

"(2) state why it is infeasible or impractical to express a performance goal in any form for the program activity.

"(c) In preparing a comprehensive and informative plan under this section, the Postal Service may aggregate, disaggregate, or consolidate program activities, except that any aggregation or consolidation may not omit or minimize the significance of any program activity constituting a major function or operation.

"(d) The Postal Service may prepare a non-public annex to its plan covering program activities or parts of program activities relating to—

"(1) the avoidance of interference with criminal prosecution; or

"(2) matters otherwise exempt from public disclosure under section 410(c) of this title.

"§ 2804. Program performance reports

"(a) The Postal Service shall prepare a report on program performance for each fiscal year, which shall be included in the annual comprehensive statement presented under section 2401(g) of this title.

"(b)(1) The program performance report shall set forth the performance indicators established in the Postal Service performance plan, along with the actual program performance achieved compared with the performance goals expressed in the plan for that fiscal year.

"(2) If performance goals are specified by descriptive statements of a minimally effective program activity and a successful program activity, the results of such program shall be described in relationship to those categories, including whether the performance failed to meet the criteria of either category.

"(c) The report for fiscal year 2000 shall include actual results for the preceding fiscal year, the report for fiscal year 2001 shall include actual results for the two preceding fiscal years, and the report for fiscal year 2002 and all subsequent reports shall include actual results for the three preceding fiscal years.

"(d) Each report shall—

"(1) review the success of achieving the performance goals of the fiscal year;

"(2) evaluate the performance plan for the current fiscal year relative to the performance achieved towards the performance goals in the fiscal year covered by the report;

"(3) explain and describe, where a performance goal has not been met (including when a program activity's performance is determined not to have met the criteria of a successful program activity under section 2803(b)(2))—

"(A) why the goal was not met;

"(B) those plans and schedules for achieving the established performance goal; and

"(C) if the performance goal is impractical or infeasible, why that is the case and what action is recommended; and

"(4) include the summary findings of those program evaluations completed during the fiscal year covered by the report.

"§ 2805. Inherently Governmental functions

"The functions and activities of this chapter shall be considered to be inherently Governmental functions. The drafting of strategic plans, performance plans, and program performance reports under this section shall be performed only by employees of the Postal Service."

SEC. 8. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT AND LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the ability of Congress to establish, amend, suspend, or annul a performance goal. Any such action shall have the effect of superseding that goal in the plan submitted under section 1105(a)(29) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) GAO REPORT.—No later than June 1, 1997, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to Congress on the implementation of this Act, including the prospects for compliance by Federal agencies beyond those participating as pilot projects under sections 1118 and 9704 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 9. TRAINING.

The Office of Personnel Management shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States, develop a strategic planning and performance measurement training component for its management training program and otherwise provide managers with an orientation on the development and use of strategic planning and program performance measurement.

SEC. 10. APPLICATION OF ACT.

No provision or amendment made by this Act may be construed as—

(1) creating any right, privilege, benefit, or entitlement for any person who is not an officer or employee of the United States acting in such capacity, and no person who is not an officer or employee of the United States acting in such capacity shall have standing to file any civil action in a court of the United States to enforce any provision or amendment made by this Act; or

(2) superseding any statutory requirement, including any requirement under section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 11. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 305 the following:

"306. Strategic plans."

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 11.—The table of sections for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1114 the following:

"1115. Performance plans.

"1116. Program performance reports.

"1117. Exemptions.

"1118. Pilot projects for performance goals.

"1119. Pilot projects for performance budgeting."

(2) AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 97.—The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 9702 the following:

"9703. Managerial accountability and flexibility."

"9704. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility."

(c) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE.—The table of chapters for part III of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"28. Strategic planning and performance management 2801".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRAGIC SHOOTING OF OFFICER ROBERT INGRAM, COBB COUNTY, GA

(Mr. DARDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, Cobb County, GA, has suffered a terrible tragedy. Marietta native Robert Ingram, 24, a member of the Cobb County police force for 2 years, was killed while on duty Tuesday. He is the first Cobb County Police Department officer to ever be slain in the line of duty.

He had radioed to a dispatcher to say he was stopping to question a suspicious person. When the dispatcher was unable to reach Officer Ingram on the car radio, additional units were sent to the scene to investigate. When they arrived, they found Officer Ingram lying on the road. He had been shot twice. His pistol was still in its holster when he was found.

When a police officer dies in the line of duty, it reminds us of the remarkable character of these individuals—those willing to take an oath to serve and protect and sometimes, unfortunately, suffer the tragic consequences. We are hopeful that the individual responsible for this crime will be brought to justice swiftly.

Mr. Speaker, this tragedy is just further evidence that we must take a strong stand against the rising tide of crime in this country by approving tough, anticrime legislation, including the death penalty for those who murder police officers.

Our sympathy and prayers are with the family of Officer Ingram, especially his wife of 3 months, Jennifer, and his fellow officers as they work through this tragedy personally and professionally.

Let us always be mindful of the great sacrifice of law enforcement personnel who put their lives on the line daily for us.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BANKING AND FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress the "Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1993". This legislative initiative will promote the creation of community development financial institutions that will empower individuals and communities and provide for greater economic opportunity. Also transmitted are a statement of the Administration's principles embodied in this proposal and a section-by-section analysis.

In too many urban and rural communities, there is a lack of capital and credit. Lending in distressed communities, particularly to small businesses, can be complicated. It may require special expertise and knowledge of the borrower and the community, credit products, subsidies, and secondary markets. Community development financial institutions—including community development banks like South Shore Bank in Chicago, community credit unions such as Self-Help in North Carolina, community development corporations, micro-enterprise loan funds, and revolving loan funds—have demonstrated that they can provide capital, credit, and development services in distressed areas and to targeted populations.

The bill proposes establishment of a Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Fund that would support a program of investment in community development financial institutions. The Fund would provide financial and technical assistance to, and serve as a national information clearinghouse for, community development financial institutions.

This initiation reaffirms my commitment to helping communities help themselves. By ensuring greater access to capital and credit, we will tap the entrepreneurial energy of America's poorest communities and enable individuals and communities to become self-sufficient.

My Administration is also committed to enhancing the role of traditional financial institutions with respect to community reinvestment. As a com-

plement to the community development financial institutions initiative, we will adopt regulatory changes to more effectively implement the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977. These changes will replace paperwork with performance-oriented standards and will include tougher enforcement measures for noncompliance.

In order to secure early enactment of legislation in this crucial area, I urge the Congress to consider the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1993 as a discrete bill, separate from general issues of financial services reform and any other nongermane amendments.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 15, 1993.

THE REAL IMPACT OF THE CLINTON TAX PLAN ON REAL PEOPLE AND REAL BUSINESSES

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue my focus today on the real impact of the Clinton tax plan on real people and real businesses.

I recently received a letter from Thomas L. French, president of the Owosso Group, a conglomerate of 12 small manufacturing firms, headquartered in West Conshohocken, in Montgomery County, PA.

Most of these firms are small subchapter S corporations that file personal tax returns. They will be hit with a new top marginal tax rate of 42.5 percent—up from the current rate of 31 percent. That is a dramatic increase.

It should be noted that these subchapter S corporations employ 800 people and have created more than 200 jobs since 1989.

Yet President Clinton has decided that no good deed should go unpunished: if you take risks, if you make investments, if you create jobs, you will be taxed until you bleed.

I spoke with the chief financial officer of Owosso, George Lemmon, Jr., and he told me: "These taxes will mean that we will take fewer risks, we will make fewer investments, and we will have less working capital."

What does that mean? It means lower economic growth and fewer jobs.

I think Owosso Group president Thomas French put it best when he wrote: "The tax package now under consideration will kill this fragile economic recovery."

Maybe the armchair Iaccocas that write the tax bills around here ought to consider that in the weeks ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from Thomas L. French, president of the Owosso Group:

THE OWOSSO GROUP,
June 29, 1993.

Hon. CURT WELDON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The attached comparison shows proposed tax increases on Sub S Corporations vs. C Corporations. Since most of the job growth in this country comes from small businesses (often S-Corporations) this proposal seems particularly crazy.

The tax package now under consideration will kill this fragile economic recovery.

I was sorry to miss the meeting regarding Tax Policy you held in Media. I'd very much like to attend any future meeting.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS L. FRENCH,
President.

THE COST OF NAFTA

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, these days we hear a lot of talk about cutting spending. Well, what about the proposed trade agreement with Mexico? How much will it cost U.S. taxpayers in actual dollars?

I say to my colleagues, "Hold on to your wallets, because NAFTA is out to suck them dry."

How much will NAFTA cost? Forty billion dollars just to start off with. That is for the cost of paying for American workers who will be thrown out of their jobs, the cost of building roads and sewers south of the border, more customs inspectors, loss of tariff revenues to our Government and price supports related to farmers in our country who are going to lose income. That sound incredible, but that is what it says right here in yesterday's New York Times based on administration and Congressional Budget Office figures.

Let me put this incredible \$40 billion in perspective. Compare it to the flood relief we are going to have to give to Iowa. We expect the President to come in here and ask for \$2½ billion. What a waste it would be to pass this treaty and send our workers' jobs to Mexico. What a waste, and what an incredible waste to spend \$40 billion to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this treaty is the place to cut spending first.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article on this subject which appeared in the New York Times:

A LOOK AT THE NORTH AMERICAN PACT'S
ADDED COSTS

(By Keith Bradsher)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—As the Clinton Administration and Congress grapple with the political problems of the North American Free Trade Agreement this summer, one issue keeps coming up: the potential cost of the pact to the Federal budget.

Estimates range up to \$40 billion in lost tariff revenue, benefits for American workers who are unemployed as a result of new competition from Mexican factories, and bridges and highways to carry additional traffic.

Congressional pay-as-you-go budget rules require that such revenue lost be made up. This has produced an increasingly desperate search in Washington for ways other than Federal taxes to raise money. The Administration and Congress are looking for as much of this as possible from state, local and private sources.

In the Administration's first public discussion of some of the costs of the agreement, Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown said today that \$15 billion to \$20 billion would be needed over the next decade for roads, bridges, sewage-treatment centers, improved housing, electric-power plants and environmental cleanup projects along the Mexican border.

MEETING IN SAN ANTONIO

But he also said that the Administration expected business to spend most of the money, spurred by potential earnings from tolls and fees from the sewage and power facilities.

On Thursday and Friday, Mr. Brown said, Clinton Cabinet members will try to drum up commercial interest at a meeting in San Antonio with Mexican Cabinet ministers and with about 400 investment bankers, engineers and state officials.

The Secretary said that private companies had ignored the potential in border investments for many years and are now recognizing it because of the proposed North American pact.

Others, though, questioned some of Mr. Brown's assumptions, including the idea that industry would step forward to provide services often supplied by the Government.

"If they're going to try to do this on the cheap, my vote counts and everyone else's vote counts show they come up short," said Charles Kamasaki a vice president of the National Council of La Raza, a Hispanic advocacy group that supports the trade pact.

BUDGET OFFICE'S ESTIMATE

After several months of work, the Congressional Budget Office this week released a detailed analysis of the prospective costs. It estimates that the agreement would cost \$2 billion to \$3 billion in tariff revenue over five years.

The pact would also result in extra spending on worker retraining, some agricultural programs and transportation and environmental programs on the border, the budget office said, providing few specific figures.

Another source of help is the Inter-American Development Bank, an institution like the World Bank, which seeks to help poor Western Hemisphere nations. It has quietly offered to create a \$10 billion fund for project loans. The Federal Government would be required to contribute only \$250 million of this, and the rest would be raised through bond issues, an international financial official with a detailed knowledge of the plan said.

Representative Esteban Torres, Democrat of California, said today that he plans to introduce legislation this week to create a North American Development Bank. The bank would be set up with \$1 billion in Federal money and would issue \$5 billion in bonds to pay for transportation, environmental and community-development projects anywhere in North America, not just in border states.

IDEA OF LOS ANGELES ACADEMIC

Creation of that bank is the idea of Raul A. Hinojosa-Ojeda, an assistant professor of planning at the University of California at Los Angeles. Mr. Hinojosa-Ojeda has strong political ties in Washington and Mexico City, and this combined with his connections

with national Hispanic groups, have gained attention for his idea in the Administration and Congress.

Mr. Kamasaki said his group supported the new bank partly because its proposed charter would provide for extensive consultation with local businesses and residents.

By making loans across the nation to communities struggling to cope with international competition, the bank could also lessen opposition to the trade agreement from members of Congress who feel that border states will be the main beneficiaries.

Representative Robert T. Matsui, a California Democrat who is organizing House support for the trade pact, said Congressional interest in the new bank was growing. But he said that a small tax on trade across the border might also be necessary.

Corporations bitterly oppose such a tax, contending that it would undo part of the benefit of tariff reductions. Mr. Matsui said that a tax could be set as low as one-quarter of 1 percent.

Current United States tariffs average 4 percent on Mexican goods, although a few items, like table glassware, face tariffs up to 30 percent.

FREE TRADE: THE COSTS . . .

Lower tariff revenues.—Estimated by the Congressional Budget Office at \$2 billion to \$3 billion over five years.

Retraining of workers who lose their jobs.—Predicted by the Clinton Administration to exceed the \$1.68 billion over five years that had been estimated by the Bush Administration.

Extra border bridges, highways and sewage treatment.—Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown said today that it would cost \$15 billion to \$20 billion over the next decade.

Extra customs inspectors.—Some in Congress want more staff members to prevent drug trafficking and other smuggling.

Extra spending on agricultural programs.—Price supports and export-finance programs would rise slightly, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

. . . AND THE POTENTIAL REVENUE SOURCES

International Boundary and Water Commission.—This Mexican-American commission—whose limited authority along the border includes controlling the salinity of the Rio Grande, approving new bridges and maintaining boundary buoys—could issue bonds to pay for bridges.

North American Development Bank.—A new institution, backed by taxpayers money from Canada, Mexico and the United States, would issue bonds to pay for projects in North America.

Inter-American Development Bank.—An existing lending institution jointly controlled by Western Hemisphere governments could create a \$10 billion fund, \$250 million of which would be Federal money. The rest could be borrowed using the bank's AAA credit rating.

Flat tax on cross-border trade in goods and services.—Critics of the proposal by Senator Max S. Baucus and the House majority leader, Representative Richard A. Gephardt, say that it would merely replace tariffs with taxes.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] scheduled for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDERS

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders reserved for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] on July 20 and 27 and August 3, 1993, be allocated to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAUNO].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DARDEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1810

COLLEGE FOOTBALL IS NO MONEYMAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the House on many occasions on the subject of gender equity in sports. Twenty-one years ago, Congress passed title IX, which provided an equal opportunity to men and women in education, including athletics. Unfortunately, women still face unequal treatment and discrimination when it comes to college sports.

Over the past year, the argument I have heard most often from opponents of gender equity is that we shouldn't touch football, because football is a big revenue producer that funds the rest of the athletic budget including women's sports.

Now, I have been researching this issue, and have found that just is not the case. With the exception of a handful of schools, football is not a big moneymaker. In most instances it is a big money loser.

The most recent study of college athletic budgets was performed by Prof. Mitchell Raiborn for the NCAA. Professor Raiborn analyzed budgets and financial trends from 1985 to 1989. A questionnaire was sent to all 803 NCAA institutions, and 454 responded.

According to the survey, 45 percent of the Division I-A schools reported a deficit in their football programs. In other words, they spent more on football than the revenues it produced. Division I-A schools are the big schools that you see on television. Among Division I-A schools, a whopping 94 percent reported a deficit. Those are schools like the historically black colleges and universities that you rarely get to see on television. Among Divisions II and III schools, 98 percent operated at a deficit.

What is perhaps even more alarming is the trend. It appears that each year,

fewer schools are sharing in the financial benefits, and more schools are losing money. In 1981, only 24 percent of Division I-A schools reported a deficit. By 1985, the number was up to 31 percent. By 1989, 45 percent reported a deficit.

It is important to note that the amounts involved are significant. Among the 45 percent of the Division I-A schools reporting a deficit in their football program, the average shortfall was \$638,000. This was up from an average of \$251,000 in 1981.

How are these deficits covered? They are paid with student activity fees, higher tuition costs, or in the case of public schools, taxpayer subsidies. These costs and taxes are paid for by men and women equally. When it comes to covering costs and paying taxes, gender equity has always been with us.

Although the other major revenue producing sport, men's basketball, has grown in popularity, it also presents a bleak financial picture at most schools. At Division I-A schools, 34 percent of the schools reported a deficit in the men's basketball program. At Division I-AA and Division I-AAA schools, 75 percent reported a deficit. At Division II schools, the number was 90 percent, and at Division III schools, 99 percent reported a loss.

The study confirmed one fact that I have pointed out in previous special orders. In 1989, Division I-A schools spent 82 percent of their operating expenses on men's programs and a mere 18 percent on women's programs.

Right now there is an ongoing dispute between the NCAA and college football coaches over the NCAA's attempt to rein in spending on football. For example, the NCAA has proposed an end to the practice of housing the home team in a hotel on the night before a game. That's right—the home team.

Iowa coach Hayden Fry, who is also head of the American Football Coaches Association disagrees. He was quoted as saying, "There are parties and a lot of other stuff going on. I can't say, 'Jim, you've got to be in bed by 11.' I can't control that. They don't understand that the atmosphere is different. Our requirements are legit."

If coach Fry cannot explain to his players, nearly all of whom are on full scholarship, why it is important to get a good night's rest before a game, and instead spends thousands of dollars on hotel rooms, something seems to be wrong with college sports. This example must be placed in the context of women looking for a few thousand dollars to maintain their program. Women at these same schools often have to sleep at friends' homes on away games, or must sleep four to a room. Meanwhile, the football team is sleeping in hotel rooms before home games.

So the next time you hear someone tell you that football is funding wom-

en's sports, ask to see the facts. The truth is that in nearly every college, women are paying for football.

HATE MONGERING: NOT IN OUR BACK YARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York, [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, this week, residents of Whitestone and Bay Terrace, Queens, New York, found their neighborhoods plastered with day-glo stickers seeking recruits for the neo-Nazi, white supremacist group, the National Alliance. People throughout the community were outraged, as I am. They are tearing down the signs and saying not in my back yard to hate mongering.

These are racially mixed neighborhoods of decent, hard-working people. They have made a life for themselves and now outsiders, intent on pitting people against one another, are coming in and trying to divide them and fuel unrest.

There should be no mistake about it. This group has ties to the American Nazi Party and the Klan. They have done too much damage already, and they have no place in our community.

I want the National Alliance and those with whom they are working to hear our message loud and clear: No hate mongering in our back yard.

TRIBUTE TO KENAN SLINIC AND BRAVE EMERGENCY RESPONSE TEAMS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I take out this special order and rise to another tragic development in the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, specifically in Sarajevo.

As many of my colleagues are aware, approximately 2½ months ago here in the Nation's Capital, we held the fifth annual national fire and emergency services dinner where we assemble all the leaders of the emergency response community in this country for a night of celebrating the good work they do and talking about their legislative priorities nationally for the following year.

At that dinner in late April we had 2,000 leaders from around the country joined by over 200 Members from both this body and the other body. We had special guests including our keynote speaker, Vice President AL GORE, but also our special guests on that evening were from faraway countries, the head of the fire and emergency services from Moscow for all of Russia, and we also had as a special guest Kenan Slinic,

who in fact has been the chief of the Sarajevo fire brigade undergoing terrible turmoil in that troubled land.

During the day we had a competition down on the Mall where five Democrats and five Republicans were assembling for a competition that was then going to be followed by firefighters from all over America in a spirited competition, and in fact, Mr. Slinic as well as the Russian firefighters joined with my Democrat colleagues because they were short some Members, and in fact beat us in the competition that occurred that day.

In the evening, we had the dinner; we also honored John Jordan, a volunteer firefighter from Rhode Island who has been going back and forth to Sarajevo for the last several months supplying life-safety equipment and emergency supplies for the people of that country, and on that evening at that event, Mr. Slinic gave a very emotional speech to the fire service of America where he talked about those members of his brave emergency response network, 10 of whom had been killed up until that point in time, who have been risking their lives to help protect the property and save lives regardless of the nationality of the people in Sarajevo and the surrounding communities.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the entire handwritten speech of Mr. Slinic, because much of it talks about the turmoil in his country and the need to have the turmoil end and stop the slaying, not just of the emergency response people but of all the innocent people in Bosnia and Herzegovina and specifically in Sarajevo.

At the end of our dinner meeting that night, I had special meetings with Senator BIDEN and STENY HOYER, cochair of the Helsinki Commission, with Mr. Slinic to talk about his very firsthand experiences. We, in fact, were preparing to go over to Sarajevo in June to deliver a planeload of supplies to the Sarajevo fire brigade, but had to push it back until August, because the fire apparatus and the other equipment had not yet been prepared. In fact, that trip is still planned.

□ 1620

Since that speech was given, three more emergency responders have been killed in Sarajevo. Yesterday, tragically, the chief of the Sarajevo fire brigade, Slinic, a warm, gentle man who cared about his comrades and his citizens, was shot behind the head twice and assassinated.

I extend the deepest and heartfelt sympathies of my colleagues and the entire fire emergency network of this country to his young wife and 6-year-old daughter. I think all of us have to reflect upon the situation in that troubled land and renew our effort to find some kind of solution to this terrible turmoil.

I insert the speech that I referred to, for the RECORD;

Vice President Gore, Congressman Weldon, fellow firefighters, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Kenan Slinic. I live in Sarajevo with my wife and 6 year old daughter.

I am commander of the Sarajevo firemen's brigade. Sarajevo is my country's capital.

In 1992 my country B/H became the youngest member in the United Nations family of nations.

On April 5, 1992 war came to my country, my city, and my people. Sarajevo and other cities of B/H were put under seige.

For one year, now Serbian artillery and rockets have rained death on Sarajevo.

Their shells have destroyed churches, mosques, and temples. They have killed Christians, Moslems, Jews, and others.

My brigade had 300 men one year ago. They are men like you.

In one year of war, 10 have been killed and 38 wounded. The Sarajevo fire brigade has responded to over 1,500 fires while under military fire in this war.

Firemen are the specific targets of anti-aircraft and machine gun fire.

Serbian forces say they are fighting against Moslems. They say Christians and others are not safe in B/H.

To know the truth I ask you to speak to the Rhode Island volunteer group, your own firemen who have fought fires with us in Sarajevo.

They will tell you of Sarajevo's 500 year history of racial ethnic and religious diversity.

They will tell you of churches, temples and mosques—side by side. They will tell of the men of the Sarajevo firemen's brigade who are Serb, Muslim, Croat, Jew and others, all praying to their gods and all looking to America, the most powerful democratic and diverse of nations to help our young nation to a free and democratic future for all its citizens.

In closing I would like to thank my host, Congressman WELDON for inviting me to this caucus.

And am especially grateful to the courageous American fireman Mr. John Jordan and his team, who saved our citizens directly and who saw and suffered a part of the horror in our lives.

I hope that I will be able to attend the next national Fire and Emergency Services dinner under much better circumstances for my country.

Thank you and God bless.

UPDATE ON NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I realized that it is 6:22 here in Washington and many of our colleagues have already left to return to their districts. But I felt compelled to take this special order out this evening in order to respond to a number of things that we said here on the House floor last night as I was given a little time to challenge some of the points that had been made by my colleagues concerning the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

So I decided this evening to try to respond to a few of those points and to talk, specifically, about that treaty.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that I am standing here alone without any of my colleagues here in the House Chamber. What I would like to do is to welcome any of my colleagues who would like to come over and either join in and participate in support of the things that I am saying or, and frankly more important, I would like any of those who are opponents to the North American Free-Trade Agreement to come and challenge me on any of the points that I am going to be making in the next few minutes.

This is really a goal that I believe we should need to have here; that is, a free exchange of ideas on this very, very hotly debated and now rather controversial issue; and that is, the implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

As I have said repeatedly here from this well and at the desk there, I happen to believe that reducing trade barriers is clearly the wave of the future. And if we are going to enhance the opportunity for U.S. workers to produce more, we have to do it through exports.

As we look at the past several years, the overwhelming majority of economic growth which has taken place in this country has been through exports. So I am concerned about creating jobs in the United States of America, and I am also concerned about an issue which is very near and dear to me as a Californian; and that is, the flight of illegal immigrants coming across the border from Mexico into the United States. That clearly is one of the most pressing problems that we have in California, because due to the fact that we here in Washington impose unfunded Federal mandates on State and local Governments, we basically tell them what they have to do, without providing the resources for them; so Californians are shouldering the cost of providing welfare, health care, criminal justice, education, and a wide range of other services for people who have entered this country illegally. And it is costing people in my State of California literally billions of dollars.

These concerns have played a key role in leading me to believe that implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement will get to the root of these problems. I supported strongly the amendment offered by my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], and others last week to increase the border patrol. I think that we should strengthen our border patrol so that people do not come across illegally. But, clearly, people will find a way to penetrate that border. What we need to do, in getting to the root of that problem, is do everything that we possibly can to ensure that they have an incentive to stay at home.

As we look at the reason people flee Mexico and come to the United States,

there really is only one, and it is economic opportunity, whether it is a job or whether it is these welfare services to which I have referred.

What we need to do is realize that many people come from Mexico across the border to make money to send back home to their families.

So, one of the things that is very important for us to do is not to provide United States dollars in foreign aid to the Mexican Government, but play a role in strengthening our relationship between the two countries, which will lift the economy of Mexico and lead people who might today feel inclined to come illegally into the United States to seek employment opportunities to send those dollars back home, to instead stay in Mexico as job opportunities are created.

Now, last night as I was engaging in the exchange with my colleagues, Messrs. BONIOR, BROWN, and Mrs. BENTLEY and Ms. KAPTUR here in the Chamber, there were a number of issues raised, and one of those was discussed by Ms. KAPTUR of Toledo, OH, who referred to the fact that many United States businesses have flowed from the United States to Mexico. She is absolutely right. I am the first to admit that we have seen many businesses leave the United States and Mexico. Do you know what? There is nothing today at all that exists that would prevent United States businesses from moving from this country to Mexico.

Let me say that again: The status quo, if we leave everything as it is today and do not implement NAFTA, there is nothing that prevents United States businesses from leaving the United States and going to Mexico.

Now, there are a wide range of reasons as to why businesses leave the United States and go to Mexico or to other parts of the world. I would like to take a few minutes to go through some of the reasons why businesses move.

There are basically three major reasons that a company would consider producing overseas: They are, No. 1, expanding sales in a current export market, basically moving from this country to Mexico so that they can take advantage of the 88-million-strong consumers who are there in Mexico.

The second reason is the opportunity to penetrate a new foreign market.

And the third is to reduce their operating costs.

Now, the majority of United States-owned factories in Mexico have been located there for the first two reasons that I have mentioned. In fact, over 70 percent of the production of American-owned manufacturing plants in Mexico produce items that are sold in Mexico, not items that are exported back to the United States. One of the things that we constantly hear from opponents of NAFTA is that U.S. businesses move to take advantage of what they call 58-

cents-an-hour labor—and it is nothing near that. The average wage rate for those in the manufacturing industry in Mexico is \$2.35 an hour. And yet the American worker is at least five times more productive.

But there are many who will argue that they move to Mexico so that they can sell those goods back into the United States. The fact of the matter is that 70 percent of those items produced by American-owned manufacturing companies in Mexico are sold in Mexico.

□ 1830

Now, if a company is interested in lowering their costs of production, what is it that they look for? Obviously, wages and the burdens of excessive regulations are important, but they are really only the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Speaker. There are many other considerations.

First, access to markets, to which I referred. Manufacturers need to be able to ship their products to market, respond to rapid changes in demand and service and provide service for their products. Each of these costs goes up as production is moved away from the final market.

It is a benefit to produce in the United States because the United States is the largest sales market. So it seems to me there are many businesses that are going to want to remain in the United States, and probably the best example came in a joint announcement that we received here a couple weeks ago from General Motors and the United Auto Workers when they decided to move a plant from Mexico back to Lansing, MI. They are building the Chevrolet Cavaliers and other vehicles, moving those from Mexico back to Lansing, MI.

Why? Because they realize that it is best for them to be closest to their largest sales market, and they also know that the American worker is five times more productive than the worker in Mexico.

Access to resources is also very important. Most production involves some raw materials, energy commodities, or standard energy commodities, or standard products used in manufacturing. Access to these resources and supplies, along with transportation costs, is something that a business must also take into consideration.

Most factors of production other than labor are much cheaper in the United States. For example, energy and transportation costs in Mexico are extremely high.

The third point is the quality and cost of infrastructure. Government must extend water, sewer and power to the location of a new plant, and the costs of those services are very important considerations that a business must make.

The cost and availability of land are also very important. Mexico is very far

behind the United States when it comes to the issue of industrial infrastructure.

Also, the fourth point, transportation infrastructure itself, the proximity to direct service airlines and major trade centers is very important, as are quality road and rail networks to keep transportation costs and delays down.

All forms of transportation infrastructure, road, rail, air, and sea, are much more developed in the United States. This lowers U.S. transportation costs and clearly increases reliability.

The proximity to retail suppliers, reliable suppliers. Companies must be able to acquire telecommunications service, machinery, supplies and transportation, along with financial and other information services. Most American firms have extensive supplier networks in the United States, most of which cannot easily be replaced and which cannot relocate. Therefore, they stay together in the United States.

The sixth point, exchange rate costs. Fluctuating exchange rates or the inability to easily shift capital in and out of a country can cause very serious disruptions in business. Conversely, companies desire investments in countries with stable currencies.

Now, doing extensive business in Mexico with the peso is historically risky, considering that there have often been controls on exchanging pesos into dollars and taking profits out of Mexico.

The seventh point, government policies. Time is money, and dealing with inefficient, corrupt or intrusive local state and national government bureaucracies can be very costly. Unfortunately, the Clinton administration may eliminate all advantages here.

The eighth point that I would like to make, education, training, and skills of labor. If workers cannot read, write, or do math, their skills may not match the level required of the new industry. Mexican workers are clearly much less, often five to six times less, as I was saying, productive than the American worker.

Work practices and work ethics. Companies cannot assume labor abroad is the exact same as labor at home. There are different senses of time and work. For example, workers in Mexico expect their plants to shut down for the hottest hours every day.

Also, speaking the same language is a tremendous plus.

When all these factors are considered, most American firms determine that producing in the United States is clearly the best deal.

Now, this whole issue of trying to gain access to markets and seeing companies move from the United States to Mexico to export back here really is a red herring when you think about the fact that the goal of the North American Free-Trade Agreement is to bring that tariff ultimately down to a zero rate.

Now, the average tariff, as I have said here many times before, on United States goods going into Mexico today is 10 percent. The average tariff on Mexican goods coming into the United States is only 4 percent. So it seems to me that we have to realize with a 2½ times higher tariff moving that rate down to zero is going to greater enhance the opportunity for us to sell in Mexico, meaning that any companies that have felt compelled to move to Mexico to take advantage of that labor force to sell things back into the United States will not have the need to do that whatsoever, or to have to move to Mexico to take advantage of the 88 million Mexican consumers, will not need to do so.

Why? Because we will have a zero tariff, so U.S. businesses will not have to move into Mexico so that they can have access to the Mexican market. They will be able to remain right here in the United States, take advantage of that zero tariff, and providing goods and services to those 88 million Mexican consumers.

Now, one other item that was raised last night that has been of great concern and we continually hear it, 58 cents an hour is the wage rate for Mexican workers. Clearly, that is not the case. People do not work in Mexico for that wage rate. The average wage rate in the manufacturing industry, and this was challenged to me last night when I was here on the floor, is \$2.35 an hour. This is actually information that came from the Department of Labor.

Now, we also have to realize there are a wide range of benefits that are provided to the Mexican workers that are not provided to American workers.

As we look at the goal of trying to have the United States compete internationally, and again I congratulate our U.S. Trade Representative, Mr. Kantor, and President Clinton for seeking a goal of trying to reduce trade barriers internationally so that we can benefit the American worker with greater opportunities for exporting the goods that they manufacture and benefit the American consumers so that they can in fact buy the best quality product at the lowest possible price, the direction we are headed in is a very positive one.

There was a meeting that was held just yesterday, sponsored by the Atlantic Monthly. Two of the participants were the former U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Carla Hills and the present U.S. Ambassador Mickey Kantor. One of the questions that was posed was what is the major difference in trade policy between the U.S. Government under the Bush administration and under the Clinton administration?

I was very pleased to see that we are seeing a continuation under the Clinton administration of a policy of trying

to diminish those trade barriers so that we can take advantage of greater exports and benefit the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other items that was raised last night that concerns me greatly was this point that was made about the corruption within the Mexican Government. My colleagues were providing some very tragic instances, and I am very sympathetic with the concerns that were raised as it relates to the standard of living for many of the workers there, human rights violations which have taken place in Mexico.

Let me say again for the record, as I said here last night. I am in no way an apologist for human rights violations for a government which would relegate its people to substandard levels of living and environmental quality. I do not support those things.

I happen to believe that implementation of NAFTA is clearly going to help us address all those items.

Now, some have said, I think it was my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who said that Mr. Salinas is simply complying with things like establishing a government-sponsored human rights monitoring organization so that he can gain the support of the United States and the Canadian Government and the rest of the international community for implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

□ 1840

Well, quite frankly, whatever the reason is, if it is a goal of trying to expand trade opportunities, and they are working to improve the human rights situation and other problems that exist in Mexico, I congratulate them for that. It is a positive sign.

As we look at that acronym that we have used, NAFTA, the North American Free-Trade Agreement, the most important word there is the middle word, the word that comes after "North America" and the word that comes before "Trade Agreement." It is "Free." We have to realize that the goal is to expand freedom.

Now, it we have this free trade taking place, clearly there are going to be fewer opportunities for the kinds of corruption which we have seen in the past take place. Why? Because there is going to be greater access and exposure to the American market, to the U.S. market.

Mr. Speaker, one of the points that needs to be made, which has been raised by a number of critics of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, is that once we get into it there is no way we can get out of it if there are problems. Well, frankly people should look at the agreement. Any of the three countries involved, Canada, the United States or Mexico, have the opportunity to withdraw from that

agreement at any time that major concerns are raised.

Now one of the things that we have also seen in the past is a one-party system of government, and last night my colleagues were talking about the fact that since 1928, when we saw the beginnings of the nationalization of the oil industry in Mexico under the Institutional Party, Institutional Revolutionary Party, which was founded by Mr. Cardenas, the father of the Presidential candidate who was running in Mexico, we have seen all kinds of corruption, all kinds of problems in Mexico, and I am the first to admit that it is very bad and very wrong, and I said here last night that in the early 1980's, under President Jose Lopez Portillo, we saw the arm of the Institutional Revolutionary Party growing even longer, extending into the banking industry, nationalizing industries, having this one-party government take control of industries which up to that point had been in private hands. But as we looked at the mid-1980's through the end of the last decade, now into the early and approaching the middle 1990's, we have seen dramatic improvement.

Now the Institutional Revolutionary Party has been in control of the presidency and the legislature since 1928. The fact of the matter is we have now seen a wide range of other candidates win in local elective office, win in governorships in Mexico, and we have also seen, as I was saying last night, a great level of privatization. President Miguel de la Madrid, who was the last President of Mexico, in 1985 and 1986 began moving on this road toward privatization, which is a very positive sign.

And I was asked here last night to proclaim that the election of President Carlos Salinas de Gortari was, in fact, a free and fair election. I cannot stand here and make that claim, but I cannot say that it was not, and I should also say that the prime opposition party in Mexico, the National Action Party, the PAM, the PAM Party, was a party which made the case throughout its existence of exactly what President Salinas has been doing.

The PAM Party is, quite frankly from my perspective, like the Republican Party here. The Republican Party, and I do not mean to make this at all partisan here, I say to my very good friend from Sacramento, but the Republican Party and the PAM Party do have in common the fact that they have as their platform less government, a free economy, those kinds of things which are major planks of our platform, and, while I know there are many thinking Democrats who pursue those goals, the Republican Party frankly has that as its main, main goal and main planks of its platform, and frankly, the National Action Party of Mexico has that, too.

President Salinas throughout his Presidency, as he has moved for privat-

ization of the telephone industry, the banking industry, a wide range of other industries, has in fact lessened the control of the Government and his party, the Institutional Revolutionary Party, on those industries, and they have done the kinds of things that the prime opposition party, the PAM Party in Mexico, has called for for a number of years.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point I would make is I am not going to certify the elections of Mexico and say how perfect they are, but I will say this: If we want to see improvement, which we have seen over the past several years, much of that improvement has taken place because of the prospect of implementing a North American Free-Trade Agreement.

Several months ago there was an article in Reason magazine which went through about six pages harshly criticizing the North American Free-Trade Agreement pointing to the many flaws that exist in that agreement, and yet the last four paragraphs of that Reason magazine article point to the fact that with all the problems that exist with NAFTA it is light-years ahead of the status quo, and so, as I listen to so many of my colleagues who have consistently stood here in the well and talked about how we cannot allow NAFTA to be implemented, we must ask them this question: Is the status quo better than implementing a North American Free-Trade Agreement?

And, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be joined here by my very good friend from Sacramento, CA, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Trade Subcommittee which had the great opportunity to have me testify before it earlier this week, and the gentleman seems to have survived my testimony before the Trade Subcommittee, and at this point I am happy to yield to one of the strongest advocates of free trade and diminishing barriers, including the barriers, including the barrier that exists between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for having this special order tonight, and I am very pleased to be able to join him and participate in this special order on NAFTA.

I have to say to the gentleman that I appreciate his remarks in particular because there has been so much misinformation regarding NAFTA, and I guess one of the problems and the reason this exists is because, when President Bush completed the NAFTA agreement, it was in August of 1992, not quite 12 months ago, and, as my colleague knows, the Members of Congress were on recess, the American public was focussing finally on the election process, the Democrats just had their convention in July, and the Republicans were in convention in the month of August, and then we came

back in September. Members were focusing on getting out of session, completing the budget, and then the general election, the Presidential election, and then after the election on November 6, the focus became the transition, and then from the transition we went into the period of the President being inaugurated into office. And now we have been preoccupied with the budget, so there really has not been a focus on the NAFTA and what it really all means and, when one thinks about NAFTA, what it is really all about.

Mr. Speaker, it is reducing tariffs. For every \$4 of tariffs that the United States imposes on Mexico's products coming into the United States, Mexico has \$10 worth of tariffs on products of the United States going into Mexico. It is a 10-to-4 relationship, or Mexican tariffs are 2½ times larger than the tariffs in the United States, and basically what this agreement does is, over a 15-year period, a 15-year period, reduces tariffs on both sides of the border to zero. That is exactly what the NAFTA does. It is certainly in the favor of the United States.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the CEO of IBM Corp., Louis Gester, who just took over and, as my colleagues know, that company is downsizing now, and they are going through some problems, but they are going to make it. Louis Gester met with me about a month ago, and he said, "You know, the Mexicans want our computers. They want IBM computers. But the Japanese, and the French, and the Germans are all going in there at the same time, and, as you know, once you buy a computer product, you usually stay with that brand unless you're really dissatisfied," and he said, "My concern is that we're probably going to have to open up an IBM plant in Mexico because right now Mexico has a 25-percent and ad valorem tariff on any computers going into Mexico, and we can't afford that cost."

□ 1850

So he says, "We will probably have to open up a plant in Mexico in order to compete with the Japanese and Germans and other countries. But if you pass NAFTA, I won't have to do that, because within 24 months after NAFTA is signed into law, that 25-percent tariff goes down to zero." He says, "In that case, I can stay in the United States, build the computers here, and ship them for nothing in terms of a tariff."

Almost every business in America will gain in terms of their exports into Mexico as result of this agreement.

Mr. DREIER. I would like to underscore one important point that my friend has just made, and that is, you know, we so often hear that the Mexican people cannot afford United States goods.

Mr. MATSUI. Let me respond to that. What is ironic, just last night I

heard part of the debate, and there is a sense that Mexico is this undeveloped country with mass poverty like Somalia.

The Japanese on a per capita basis today buy \$400 worth of United States goods a year. For each Japanese in Japan they buy \$400 worth of United States goods a year.

Mexicans buy \$380 per year per capita in United States goods. So they are only \$20 short of the Japanese.

Mr. DREIER. And most people certainly think that the people of Japan have a higher standard of living than the people of Mexico.

Mr. MATSUI. Exactly. If we assist the Mexicans in the sense of helping them open up their markets and become a free market economy, they will probably triple that in the next 10 years, and maybe quadruple that. This agreement is really to the advantage of the United States.

Mr. DREIER. If I could make one more point on that particular item, and that is one of the things I have found, where we represent a border state, having been in Mexico, is that the Mexican people clearly want to have the opportunity to acquire United States-manufactured goods. It is something that is greatly desired by them.

Mr. MATSUI. If I may also just state that there has been predilections both ways, a number of different ways, in terms of how many jobs will be created, and this really comes down to an issue of job creation.

Almost every credible study indicates that this will create anywhere from half a million jobs, maybe up to a million jobs. Conservative studies show that it will create 200,000 jobs over the next 5 to 10 years. So there is just no question that this is in the interest of the United States.

I might point out that I would ask Members to read this recent CBO paper and CBO study. The CBO study came out in July of this year, from the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan study that indicates this will create jobs. It is a net plus to the United States over the next decade in terms of our gross domestic product. So this agreement has a lot of misunderstandings.

If I may just make one additional comment, there is always this talk about job loss. What is ironic is whenever you hear a Member or anyone talk about job losses of jobs going into Mexico, it is happening now. It is happening now without NAFTA.

The reason it is happening without NAFTA is because right now what is going on is that when companies want to go down there, they can go down there. We are not going to stop investments from going off of our borders or off of our shores. So what they are talking about is a current existing situation. NAFTA has nothing to do with the fact that there are companies down there.

In fact, one interesting thing is that the big three auto companies want to sell cars in Mexico. Well, the Mexican government, without NAFTA, said, "Before you can do that, you have to build plants in Mexico." So that is why there are some big three auto plants down there. It is not because they want to go down there; it is because they were asked to do it before they could sell their products. Essentially that would not have happened had we had a free trade agreement with the Mexicans.

Mr. DREIER. As I was saying a few minutes ago before our friend joined us here, the decision by the United Auto Workers and General Motors to move their plant from Mexico back to Lansing, MI, was based in large part on the fact that the American worker is at least five times more productive than the Mexican worker, but also the opportunity that they will have with a zero tariff to sell automobiles manufactured in the United States in that Mexican market. I think that point needs to be made here, that as we have listened to all the problems that people have discussed as it relates to Mexico and the rhetoric that has come out over the past several weeks and months, we have to realize that while we constantly believe we are buying all these cheap goods from Mexico, that in 1985 we had a \$4.9 billion trade deficit with Mexico. We in fact were buying \$4.9 billion more in goods and services from Mexico than they were buying from us.

Yet, as this privatization to which I was referring earlier has taken place, privatization of the banking industry, these tremendous moves which have taken place, and maintenance of basically the current tariff structure, it has not changed dramatically—there has been some improvement, but not dramatically over the past few years—we have seen us move from that \$4.9 billion trade deficit to a nearly \$6 billion trade surplus last year.

Basically, these people, who are so impoverished and cannot afford to buy any U.S. goods, as opponents of NAFTA like to say, bought \$6 billion more in goods from the United States than we bought from them.

Mr. MATSUI. I appreciate the gentleman bringing that up, because we have a trade surplus that will grow with continuing trade with Mexico.

Let me just make two points, because I know you have other gentlemen that would like to comment.

Mr. DREIER. I hope the gentleman will stay with us, because we would like to have an exchange of ideas here.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we have heard concern about the environment. Whenever we talk about NAFTA, people say, "Look at the environment. Look at what is happening right now down there in Mexico."

Well, the way we deal with this issue is by having NAFTA. Then the United

States will be able to have supplemental agreements. You might have a border development bank that we are talking about now. That is the way you clean up the borders, by having a relationship, an economic relationship.

Second, also it helps because you are going to raise the standard of living of the Mexicans, just as you help our economy. As a result of that, the Mexicans will want to put some of those resources into environmental quality, into environmental cleanup.

Last, and I think this is important as well, although the issue is jobs, we really have to focus on jobs. This will create jobs. But in addition to that, there is the immigration problem. If the Mexican standard of living increases, you will not see the flow of immigrants coming into the United States.

We heard last night in terms of the fact that it was said that Mexico is a dictatorship. President Salinas, who is a Harvard grad—and I guess we could hold that against him—but he is a Harvard grad, he knows the United States well. He wants a country that is democratic. He wants a country that is a free market like the United States and a democratic country. He has taken a major political risk at this time by supporting and strongly pushing NAFTA, because what he wants to do is open up his markets, open up this country to the liberal philosophy that we have in terms of the free expression of free ideas. And the only way he is going to get that is by having continuing trade and a flourishing economy in his country.

Mr. DREIER. I would argue that one of the reasons that President Salinas has taken this bold risk of supporting a North American Free-Trade Agreement is that as you look at some of the other risks that he has taken, he has had a great deal of success with them: that move towards privatization, where the government got out of a wide range of industries; looking at the improvement of the environment by passing in 1988 the toughest environmental laws modeled after ours; closing down the largest refinery in Mexico City, which forced 5,000 Mexican workers out of work so that he could improve the quality of life in Mexico City. He was heralded or taking those risky, controversial moves. I think that laid the groundwork for him to take this tough and bold, very positive move, which clearly is the wave of the future.

At this point I would like to yield to my friend from Orange County, and I would like to ask him a couple of questions. Then I would like to ask a couple of questions of my friend from Sacramento.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support both of my colleagues. I think it is notable that we have Members here from both parties. My colleague, Mr. MATSUI, presented to

us a Congressional Budget Office study. For those who are listening to this presentation, let us note that the Congressional Budget Office, no one has ever accused it on this side of the aisle of being this bastion of business and bastion of capitalism. In fact, if we were going to think that there would be any bias in the Congressional Budget Office study on an issue like this dealing with a commercial treaty, we would think it would be skewed in the other direction.

So the fact that it shows there is going to be growth in jobs in the United States and it will be helpful to our economy indicates and underscores that this is truly going to be a positive factor for the United States of America and for employment in the United States of America.

Also I was very, very pleased to hear the discussion about the environment. Just on theory, before you go into specifics on Mexico, I want to note that Mexico's environment has been damaged greatly during the years when the economy in Mexico was so bad.

Many of the things they point to in Mexico to say look how terrible the environment is are things that happened not under Mr. Salinas' administration, but things that happened when the economy in Mexico was sinking.

All over the world we find that when you have industrialization and growth in the economy, that is when those countries can afford to invest in the modern technology that reduces pollution and reduces the threat to the environment.

□ 1900

Mr. DREIER. If I may interject on that one point, some of those who were criticizing NAFTA here last night said that Mexico has the greatest laws on the books and yet they do not enforce them.

One of the things that I have been told by Herminio Blanco, who is the chief negotiator on the North American Free-Trade Agreement on behalf of the Mexican Government, is that, yes, it is very tough for them to regulate these heavy industries that, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] has said, grew under a government system that was more corrupt, less concerned about environmental quality.

So what they have said is that about the only way that they can really improve the environmental quality is through NAFTA, because obviously, as we increase the standard of living, the demand for a cleaner environment on the part of a wealthier, more successful people will be enhanced. And what we will see, of course, is that new industries coming in will be better equipped to comply with those environmental regulations which now some older, heavier industries could never comply with whatsoever.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Because the wealth does not exist. Unless you have an upward growing economy, the wealth will not exist to invest in the technology which will solve these pollution problems.

Unfortunately, Mexico, over the last 40 years, has suffered under administrations that were corrupt and often incompetent. And quite often, in order to excuse their corruption and incompetence, they would stir up hatred against the United States of America.

At last we have an administration in Mexico that is trying their very hardest to work with the United States so that we can work in cooperation so that both our countries will progress. I think the worst possible signal we could send to the world is that when at least you have an administration that is attempting to reform, that has been so long overdue in Mexico, that America slaps it down.

If that happens, what is going to happen to Mexico at that point? What will happen to their economy? For the last few years, the economy has been growing because of the reforms. If we slap the reformers down, it will be back to the old ways. Talk about an illegal alien problem. Then when the economy is on the downturn in Mexico, talk about environmental problems, when their economy goes into a downturn because they have thrown out the reformers.

Mr. DREIER. What kind of signal does that send in this hemisphere when the United States of America is more than willing to embark on a free-trade agreement with Israel, on a free-trade agreement with Canada? And yet, our southern neighbor, right at our border, we will not embark on a trade agreement there. When we look at the hundreds of millions of people who live in this hemisphere, in the Americas, it is imperative for us to not stick our head in the sand. It is imperative for us to try and figure out ways in which all countries in this region can take advantage of markets and labor.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. This would be worse.

Mr. MATSUI. I would like to add to that, because it almost borders on paranoia for people to be concerned about the Mexican economy. I hear people say that they are not competitive. Our time was in the past, and we cannot compete with the Mexicans.

People have to understand that the Mexican economy is just 2 percent of what the United States economy is. They have 80 million people; we have 250 million people. But their economy is only about 2 percent of our economy.

Mr. DREIER. There are so many people here in this country who are absolutely scared to death about that.

Mr. MATSUI. What we see, what I envision is over the next 20 years a market that wants to grow. And this is where United States products will

come in: automobiles, high-technology equipment, computers, you name it, the Mexicans will want our equipment and our manufacturing base. It is just going to be a very positive element of growth.

In fact, it is one of the few elements of growth in California, as the gentleman from California know.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If their economy continues to grow, which we all hope and pray that it will, who will be selling them those computers, those automobiles, the hospital equipment? In Orange County, we have a tremendous industry in hospital technology. Who will be selling that technology, that equipment, those machines, those products that are produced with high-quality American jobs?

Mr. DREIER. And the environmental technology that is going to be demanded there is another growing industry.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Who will sell those things? If we slap down the NAFTA treaty, that means the United States will be competing on an equal footing with our foreign competitors in Europe and in Asia. If we, instead, have a free-trade agreement with Mexico, as the Mexican economy grows, we will be supplying those needs from within the tariff barriers instead of having to compete with our competitors outside of the tariff barriers.

It is a formula. It is a win-win formula for Mexico and the United States.

Mr. DREIER. I think that is one of the most important points that needs to be made here. There are so many who look at the issue of trade and believe that it is a zero-sum game. It is not a zero-sum game. It is a win-win situation for us.

As we look at the European Community, and a number of Members last night were talking about the difficulty in negotiating amongst some of the wealthier countries in Western Europe, countries like Spain, Portugal, and Greece, where wage rates were significantly lower.

Quite frankly, we have to realize that there was a beneficial arrangement that was embarked upon, phased in as this package will be phased in over a period of time. So it has been a win-win. But as we look at that powerful emerging market there and then as we look to the Pacific rim, where we see countries unifying in free-trade agreements, one of the things that has to be, if you look down at South America and see Argentina and Brazil, the unification that is taking place among South American countries, how we in the United States can believe that we can stand here, pound our chests, stick our heads in the sand and say that we are going to be totally self-sufficient and not realize that the tremendous growth which this country has enjoyed over the past several years has come overwhelmingly due to exports to so many of those markets.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The statistics that you mentioned earlier, a \$6 billion surplus today versus a nearly \$5 billion deficit only a few years ago. If that can be attributed directly to a Mexican economy that is now growing and an administration that is reaching out to have a cooperative relationship with the United States, as the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] stated, that the Mexican economy is so small now, so if it continues to grow, what a tremendous amount of new jobs will be created here as Mexico grows and we are providing them with computers. And we are providing them with the office equipment and we are providing them with the heavy machinery and the bulldozers, et cetera, that they need to build a stronger and bigger economy.

That growth, that change around from a \$5 billion deficit to a \$6 billion surplus was done in a very short period of time simply because the Mexican economy began to grow. The reformers were on the ascendancy. If we can look forward to that type of change in the next 20 years, what a tremendous impact it will have on our society.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. We know full-well that there are other countries in Latin America who are closely watching the negotiating process and the activities here in the U.S. Congress as it relates to NAFTA. Why? Because they want to be able to take advantage of markets and provide labor themselves. They want to see the kind of exchange that they can embark upon with the United States throughout Central America and other parts of South America.

Mr. MATSUI. If the gentleman will continue to yield, what he says is correct. Not only about Latin America watching us on this NAFTA issue but also the Europeans and the Japanese.

As you know, the President was in Tokyo last week. And he came up with a framework with the Prime Minister of Japan, and that will be further negotiated, trying to open up the Japanese markets.

Now, if we turn NAFTA down, I can tell you, the Japanese will not continue negotiating with the United States. So what is ironic is that it is in the interest of those Members that represent the Rust Belt to actually support NAFTA.

First of all, it will not hurt their region but, second, it will make the President stronger in terms of his negotiations in opening up the Japanese market.

In addition to that, as you know, the GATT negotiations, even though we made major strides in terms of some of the tariff reductions and market opening provisions at the Tokyo round just last week, some of the tough decisions still have to be made.

For example, the French, on the agricultural subsidies issue, many of the

French political leaders are worried that they have offended their agricultural base, political base in France. If we do not pass NAFTA, the French are going to say, "Why should we stick our necks out on GATT?" That will jeopardize the GATT discussions.

So the NAFTA issue is one in which the world, in addition to Latin America, the world is looking at the United States in terms of our leadership.

Mr. DREIER. That is a very good point that my friend makes. I think we need to reiterate that one more time.

If you look at the prospect of any kind of international trade agreement in which the United States of America hopes to participate, then rejection of NAFTA will basically say the word of the United States is basically worthless.

□ 1910

We will have embarked on this agreement, we will have, in good faith, negotiated it with Canada and Mexico, and then people here in the United States decided to just throw it out the window. Other countries will say, "Gosh, why should we sit down with these people, who basically do not keep their word and basically do not want to proceed on the road toward reducing the tariff barriers that exist?"

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the flip side of this same argument that the gentleman is making, one side is if we turn it down, we have lost credibility, but on the other side, if we succeed with Mexico, it gives us tremendous leverage in negotiating with the Japanese and others who now know we do not need them as much, because we have a free trade zone here on the North American Continent that can match in resources and in human potential any trade zone in the world, including the EC and including what we can face in Asia.

The fact is, it will give our negotiators tremendous leverage in dealing with potential customers, and we can get a better deal on the next negotiation.

Mr. MATSUI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MATSUI. The gentleman is correct. We will have, if we have this free trade agreement passed, we will have a market of 360 million people. It will be the largest free market in the history of the human race.

Mr. DREIER. Six trillion dollars.

Mr. MATSUI. Incomprehensible. It will create so many more jobs, so many more investments and opportunities. That is why both President Clinton, President Bush, former President Reagan, the USTR, Mickey Kantor, the

former USTR, Carla Hills, they all support this.

The experts in the area of trade and foreign policy and jobs support this agreement, including the Secretary of Labor, Bob Reich. As we know, he supports very strongly NAFTA, because he knows that this is going to create American jobs.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman mentioned just a few minutes ago that some in the Rust Belt might not be inclined to be supportive of NAFTA. We know of the opposition that has come from them.

Frankly, as we look at many of the heavy industries that exist in this country today, they are exporting in great numbers to Mexico today. Even with the tariff structure that exists, with that 10 percent tariff to which we have been referring, that happens.

If we look at trying to eliminate that barrier, these heavy industries, like Caterpillar and other industries, are going to be greatly enhanced with the opportunity to export even higher levels with a zero tariff in Mexico.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I have been shocked recently by statements of opponents, maybe not public statements but private statements, made by opponents of the NAFTA agreement who are portraying President Salinas, and I would say to the gentleman, Mr. MATSUI, before he leaves, I would like to just ask him, because he has met President Salinas, I would like his personal analysis of this man.

I met President Salinas only once, but I was tremendously impressed, and have been tremendously impressed with his commitment in Mexico to reform. Many people have been portraying him as some sort of a negative figure. I happen to believe that President Salinas is probably one of the more heroic individuals in our lifetime.

Mr. DREIER. I will respond. I have met with President Salinas probably a dozen times over the past several years. I know his father very well. In fact, in my first United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference that I attended in 1991, when President Lopez Portillo bragged about nationalizing the banking system, I was sitting with now President Salinas' father, who is an economist who lives in Mexico City.

Clearly the training that he received here in the United States and the recognition that the wave of the future, with the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, the changes and moves of totalitarian countries to freedom and free markets, is obviously the route to take.

President Salinas has recognized that. He recognized it early on. He had it as a positive goal. I cannot say enough about his economic program, which has been designed to improve relations there.

I am sure my friend, the gentleman from Sacramento, CA [Mr. MATSUI] has also met with him.

Mr. MATSUI. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, there is just no question that President Salinas is a visionary. He wants to make the Mexican system of government similar to the system we have in the United States. He is doing it at a major, major political risk.

As we all know, Mexico has been a nationalistic country over its history. We have had battles with Mexico, as the Members know, in the 1800's. They claim that we took a third of their territory, so they are very, to some extent, anti-American, but President Salinas has gone in and he has attempted over a period of years to change that.

He wants to foster a strong, positive relationship between the United States and Mexico. For us, for us in this country to even consider turning down this great statesperson would be tragic, and it would be tragic in terms of our long-term bilateral relations, not only economically, but diplomatically as well.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman will yield, I believe there are men and women like President Salinas throughout the world who would step forward and offer leadership to their people and start working together, not only with the United States but with others, to build a better world, but if they would step forward, and if we do this to President Salinas and slap him down, so he loses face with his own people, I believe that the people all over the world will take that as a signal that "We cannot trust the Americans," people of integrity.

As I say, here is a president who probably exemplifies a higher level of integrity and certainly capability than past presidents of his country. This man has stepped forward. He has put himself on the line. If we want others around the world to take courageous steps to better their people and to make a better humankind, we have to stick with Salinas.

Mr. DREIER. Let me say, those who are not here this evening, and obviously, as we discussed earlier, there are many people who have left town, clearly I think the RECORD should show that we are more than willing to stand here virtually every evening, if we possibly can with the exigencies of our schedule, to discuss this issue.

At the outset I said that I would welcome any opponents to NAFTA to come here and raise questions of us, and we will try our darnedest to provide answers, because we are in no way trying to control this issue.

I think last night I had my dear friend, the gentleman from Mount Clemens, MI [Mr. BONIOR], my colleague on the Committee on Rules, yield a little of his time to me so I could raise some questions and respond to some of the criticism that has been leveled.

I would say that anyone who has followed this debate should certainly

raise questions of us, contact our offices, and I think when one looks at what it is we are trying to accomplish, we want to create jobs in the United States of America, we want to boost economic growth here, we want to decrease the flow of illegal immigration from Mexico to the United States.

What we have done is, we have realized that John F. Kennedy was absolutely right when he said that, "A rising tide lifts all ships." There is no benefit whatsoever to the United States in trying to attain those goals of increasing the half million jobs in the United States that NAFTA will create, increasing economic growth, and decreasing the flow of illegal immigration, if we abandon our southern neighbor. There is no benefit to us whatsoever to have a poor southern neighbor.

Our time, I have just been told, is waning here. Would my friend like to offer one more comment?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. On another subject, actually, if the gentleman would yield to me at the end of his presentation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, Covina, CA, could be the start of a trend.

This morning in the House-Senate conference the largest tax bill in the history of the world got underway.

As the conferees begin their work they, and all my colleagues, should take heed of a recent event in the city of Covina, CA.

Recently the city council in Covina enacted a 6-percent utility tax. This equates to about \$12.60 per household per month.

The 219 Members who voted for the Clinton tax bill earlier this year, take note.

The day before yesterday Covina held a recall election—the entire Covina City Council was recalled, remember New Jersey, it once had a legislature solidly controlled by big-taxing, big-spending Democrats.

So that the 219 Members who voted for the largest tax increase in the history of the world can reflect on what the Covina recall might mean to their careers.

□ 1920

I would like, in order to underscore this point, to include in the RECORD a copy of an article from the Los Angeles Times about the election in Covina, CA.

The article referred to follows:
[From the Los Angeles Times, July 15, 1993]
FEAR OF RECALL TREND GROWS WITH LATEST OUSTER

(By Andrew LePage)

The resounding recall Tuesday of the entire Covina City Council because of the city's 6% utility tax is the latest sign that voter

resentment over new taxes and fees is growing, city officials, taxpayer groups and academics say.

"We're seeing more and more of these recalls efforts, many of them successful, throughout the state," said Alan Heslop, a professor of government studies at Claremont McKenna College. "Generally, money in the form of some kind of tax or fee is at the bottom of the dispute."

"I suspect a lot of city council members throughout the state will be very frightened by what occurred in Covina," said Sheri Erlewine, spokeswoman for the California League of Cities. "We are seeing recall being considered more and more in communities."

"It's ugly out there—every city is facing what Covina is facing," Erlewine said. "There just isn't enough money anymore to pay for what the people want."

Record numbers of Covina voters, angry over the tax on gas, electricity, water and telephone bills that the council imposed last year to balance its budget, flocked to the polls to dump their council members. The vote set up an Oct. 5 special election in which five newcomers will be elected. Until then, current members will remain on the council.

"It's tough. I'm extremely disappointed and I'm sorry for the community," Councilman John King said. "I think we're seeing a desperate moment in Covina's history. Our financial problems won't go away—it won't be any easier for the new council."

Mayor Henry Morgan and council members King, Chris Richardson, Chris Lancaster and Richard Gratton were defeated. Morgan will lose his seat on the South Coast Air Quality Management District.

All of them said they had done everything in their power to convince voters that they adopted the tax on utility bills only after cutting the city budget to the bone. Further cuts, they said, would weaken police, fire and library services.

But recall leaders argued that the tax would not be needed if the council had kept a tight rein on finances. The tax costs the average household about \$12.60 a month.

"This recall will have a broad impact—cities will start checking their budgets two or three more times to make sure they've done everything possible to cut costs," said Kris Vosburgh, executive director of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn.

A growing number of citizen groups have been calling his organization, he said, for advice on fighting new taxes and fees in their communities.

"The common thread is that these people feel their elected officials are detached, arrogant and don't share the [financial] problems of the average taxpayer," Vosburgh said.

The electorate of Covina, a town of 43,000 in the flatlands of the east San Gabriel Valley, includes a sizable population of elderly people on fixed incomes.

Retirees started the petition drive that forced the council into a recall election, helping to organize 200 volunteers and to raise about \$8,000 in donations for pro-recall mailers and signs that dotted lawns throughout the community.

"We're overwhelmed by the outcome," said Stop the Utility Tax Committee leader Earl P. Purkhiser, a retired economics and accounting professor at Mt. San Antonio College in Walnut. "The next council will have to spend money like it was its own."

City officials elsewhere say that they have had little choice but to raise taxes, but that educating the public is the key to avoiding voter backlash.

In Pasadena, where voters last month overwhelmingly approved a \$1.3-million tax to bolster the library system, Mayor Rick Cole said the city's yearlong campaign to educate residents on the need for the tax was the key to success.

Despite the successful recall drive in Covina over the utility tax, he said, it would be "stupid to draw the conclusion that you can't raise taxes."

Rather, he said, council members should realize that the public "can't be railroaded," and councils must take the time to build community understanding of their budget crisis and possible solutions before imposing a new tax.

The same day the Covina council went down to defeat, the nearby community of Sierra Madre tentatively approved a 6% utility tax. City officials said there was little opposition to the tax because the city reached out to the public at several community meetings to discuss the budget deficit.

Utility taxes have been around for years, but cities have increasingly turned to them, and to assessment fees that appear on property tax bills, during harsh economic times. Taxpayer groups say the taxes and fees are convenient ways to skirt Proposition 13 because most do not need to go before voters.

The anti-tax backlash in Covina is hardly unique. Over the last two years, several recall groups in the state have succeeded in recalling a majority of the council members.

Upset over an assessment for lighting and landscaping, voters in the Northern California town of Pacifica ousted four of five council members last year. In Morgan Hill, council approval of a 9% utility tax led to the recall of three of five council members in December, 1991.

For taxpayer groups, Covina's recall election is convincing proof that the tax revolt of the proposition 13 era is not dead.

"We think San Gabriel Valley governments will sit up and take notice that people want spending under control," said Tom Biesek, a founding member of a citizen taxpayer association in South Pasadena that is fighting a proposed landscaping fee.

THE VIETNAM WAR MEMORIAL: SONS OF GUAM SHALL BE REMEMBERED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam War Memorial is one of our Nation's most powerful monuments, and over and above that, it has added meaning to those of my generation. Stoic black granite slabs bear names of thousands of Americans who lost their lives in the war. It is this image of names—simple, silent, palpable reminders of real people who died and the places that they come from lends such poignancy to the memorial.

But to truly honor the names on that wall, we must make sure that the monument's directory contains accurate information. Today, I rise to remember those service members from Guam who lost their lives in Vietnam but who, due to bureaucratic errors, are not listed as sons of Guam.

For my generation the names of those who died bring to mind the

memories of friendships and relatives, good times and bad times, our time together in schools, on playgrounds, and even times that we played war, little knowing that for some members of that generation, a real war awaited them with real sacrifices and real danger.

It even brings to mind those who did not fight but who were part of the same generation, those who even expressed doubts about the policy which was being pursued. All of these images come to mind as we reflect on the names on the wall; as we look at the letters of individuals like Vicente Guerrero and Alan Damian and see in those letters the brave brown faces who represented their generation and their island and their contribution to the Nation.

This Saturday, a replica of the Vietnam Memorial will be publicly displayed on our island. The families of those servicemen from Guam who are not listed as such deserve, at the very least, an examination of the record and an attempt to set it straight.

It is fitting that the replica of the Vietnam War Memorial come to Guam a few days before the 49th anniversary of the liberation of Guam during World War II. The people of Guam will be unable to separate the war experience of the previous generation with that of the current one. Unveiling the war memorial on July 17 and celebrating Liberation Day on July 21 offers some very direct lessons.

Just like the generation who experienced World War II suffered like no other American community during the war, the Vietnam war generation also contributed disproportionately to the names of that wall. The 72 names of Guam's young men represented a sacrifice far in excess of that experienced by any similarly sized community. Guam suffered more casualties per capita in the Vietnam war than any other territory or State in this country.

It would be less than honest, and a disservice to the memory of these men, to not let the rest of the Nation know that these men died in honor of a flag and a set of principles and values which were not, and are still not extended to their homeland. Their island of Guam still has not exercised full self-determination, their island of Guam still does not have a form of government which proceeds from their own authority, their island of Guam still does not have full representation in the Nation's Capital, their island of Guam still deals with the Federal Government in an unequal relationship born of a colonial context nearly 100 years ago in the Spanish American War.

Giving the absolute and supreme sacrifice willingly and without conditions should not mean that these men and the land they represent should be taken for granted. Indeed, the fact that

they put themselves in harm's way unselfishly should mean that their homeland of Guam should be allowed to govern itself as a new commonwealth in partnership with the United States. This is what their brothers and sisters in their generation have clearly decided as the next step in their political development. And this is why I have introduced H.R. 1521, a bill to grant commonwealth status to the island of Guam.

Earlier this week, I contacted the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, the Department of the Army, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps to express my concern that some of Guam's young men in the Vietnam War Memorial Directory are not listed as being from Guam. Jan Scruggs of the Memorial Fund told me in a letter that he would work with me and the Department of Defense to correct the record.

My office received a memo from the Commandant of the Marine Corps. His staff will conduct research at the National Personal Records Center in St. Louis and strive to rectify any inaccuracies in the memorial names directory.

I also received a letter from the Department of the Army. They were appreciative to learn of possible errors in the directory of names and assured me that every effort will be made to investigate the names submitted by my constituents and, where appropriate, make changes in the record.

I am grateful to the armed services and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund for their quick responses to my office's inquiries. I am also thankful to John Blaz of Guam's Department of Veterans' Affairs for shedding light on this issue. I want to relay my thanks and congratulations to former Guam Senator Jerry Rivera for his efforts in bringing the wall to Guam and Northwest Airlines for bringing the wall to Guam and we thank John Devitt—the builder of the wall.

I am attaching for the RECORD a complete list of all the servicemen from Guam who lost their lives in the Vietnam war. It includes men who are shown incorrectly as residents of States or territories other than Guam.

I intend to take every step necessary to make sure all the sons of Guam are accounted for. I do this for their families and for all of us who cherish our island and who wish to demonstrate to our fellow citizens the extent of our contribution to the Nation.

Let us never forget to honor the sacrifices of these men. Let us never forget their names or their faces. But let us also never forget who they were as a people, what they experienced, what their parents and their grandparents experienced, what their homeland has been through and where their homeland wants to go. Let us understand their sacrifice in the full light of democracy, in the full glory of demo-

cratic principles, in the bright sunshine of the natural desire to govern oneself. Let us recognize their sacrifice by extending to Guam the full meaning of democracy and self-government which the Stars and Stripes draped on their coffins represent.

SONS OF GUAM

Listed below in alphabetical order are the names of the 72 men from Guam whose names appear on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC:

Aguon, Jose Q.
 Asanoma, Francisco M.
 Benavente, David G.
 Biagini, Mark F.S.
 Blaz, Anthony M.
 Blaz, James L.
 Borja, Juan S.
 Cabrera, Joaquin C.
 Camacho, David B.
 Camacho, Gregorio M.
 Castro, Juan P.R.
 Cepeda, Juan D.
 Cruz, Edward C.
 Cruz, Enrique S.
 Cruz, Joseph A.
 Cruz, Joseph W.
 Cruz, Pedro A.
 Cavaite, Ronald P.
 Damian, Allan I.
 De Leon, Herman B.
 Delta Cruz, Frederico
 Diaz, Edward R.
 Doyle, Albert B.
 Duenas, Jose B.
 Duenas, Juan L.B.
 Espinosa, Vincente T.
 Esteves, Fernando B.
 Eustaquio, Joseph M.
 Finney, Harold J., Jr.
 Flores, Denny S.N.
 Flores, David C.
 Funes, David John
 Gordon, David A.
 Guerrero, Pedro R.
 Guerrero, Vicente F.
 Herrera, Jose B.
 Mariano, Jesus R.
 Mendiola, Roberto L.G.
 Meno, George S.
 Meno, Jesus Q.
 Meno, Roy F.
 Mesa, Thomas R.
 Moreham, Vincent P.
 Nededog, Emilio N.
 Pangelinan, Gregorio L.
 Pangelinan, Pedro C.
 Pereda, Henry P.
 Perez, John A.
 Perez, Vicente D.
 Quenga, Johnny C.
 Quidachay, Jesus A.
 Quintanilla, Jeffrey I.
 Reyes, Tomas G.
 Rippel, Eugene R.
 Rivera, Tomas S.
 Rodriguez, Lucas H.
 Sablan, Antonio Q.
 Sablan, Ignacio E.
 Sablan, John T.
 Sablan, Thomas Q.
 San Nicholas, Rufo S.
 San Nicholas, Victor P.
 Sanchez, George S.
 Santos, Enrique R.
 Santos, Ernesto P.
 Santos, James A.
 Santos, Rafael S.
 Taitague, Johnny S.
 Torre, Francis S.N.
 Torres, Prishado T.
 Violet, James A.

Yokoi, Ralph S.

□ 1930

THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time, and I hope I will be joined by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], who had also taken time this evening in order to report to the House and to the American people on the U.S. delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

We had a very successful meeting of our delegation in Helsinki, Finland, and I am pleased to report on some of the progress that took place during the meeting.

It was the second meeting of the Parliamentary Assembly, which is a group representing the 53 member states of the CSCE, whose parliamentarians meet once a year in order to take up issues that are important under the Helsinki accords. At this meeting we had 300 parliamentarians who were present representing 45 states.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield, if I might, to the chairman of our delegation, but before I do, I want to express on behalf of all of the Members who participated in the U.S. delegation, on behalf of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], our deep appreciation to the leadership that was exhibited by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] in leading our delegation.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has developed an international reputation for being an outspoken leader in favor of human rights and speaking up for those people around the Nation who need a champion on human rights issues.

We were very proud to have as our chairman of our delegation the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and he was recognized by the other parliamentarians around the CSCE when they chose him to be the chairman of the human rights basket of the Helsinki meeting, not only for the second meeting of the Parliamentary Assembly, but elected him as their ongoing chairman for those issues.

It is my pleasure to yield to Congressman HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], and one of the two newest members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, known as the Helsinki Commission. The gentleman from

Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] has been a very faithful participant in raising the banner of human rights and international cooperation as he has participated in numerous meetings, hearings, and, indeed, visitations with reference to the Helsinki Commission's work.

I am also pleased to be here on the floor with my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY], who has also just been appointed as a member of the Helsinki Commission.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] has briefly outlined the parameters of the CSCE Parliamentary Assembly on which we are reporting tonight, 53 nations, recently grown to that figure from the original 35 as the Soviet Union broke up into constituent parts, and many new and independent sovereign states were formed. They have joined the Helsinki process and are now signatory states to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

As the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] said, nearly 300 parliamentarians participated from 45 CSCE countries in the meeting that was recently held in Helsinki. In addition, the Council of Europe was represented, the Western European Union was represented, the North Atlantic Assembly, the Interparliamentary Union, and NATO. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was also represented, as was Japan for the first time.

Ilkka Suominen, Speaker of the Finnish Parliament, presided over the plenary sessions in his capacity as president of the CSCE Parliamentary Assembly and did an outstanding job. Several distinguished speakers also addressed the parliamentarians that were assembled in Helsinki, including Madam Ugglas, the Foreign Minister of Sweden, and Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE Council of Ministers; Vladimir Petrovsky, Director-General of the United Nations, also addressed us; and Max van der Stoep, CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities; and Mr. Franchis, Deputy Secretary General of NATO.

Mr. Speaker, while the U.S. delegation was less than a third of its allotted size, its members were strong and active. We left Helsinki, I believe, firmly convinced that the meeting would have been significantly different had our delegation not attended.

The work of the Parliamentary Assembly was divided, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], I think, has already referenced, into three committees.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] played a leading role in the General Committee on Political Affairs and Security, where their strong amendment covering the appalling situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina prompted heated debate

over the course of the meeting. The resolution which they introduced on behalf of the United States delegation called for a series of very specific and meaningful actions in response to the continued aggression and genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina; first, lifting of the arms embargo against Bosnia, a policy which many of us have advocated for some period of time, a policy which we believe says to one of the combatants in a confrontation which is taking the lives of not only combatants but innocent children, innocent women, innocent men, standby folks who are not involved in the war, but who wish to live free and to live peacefully but are not allowed to do so because of the marauders invading their communities.

In addition, it called for neutralizing of heavy weapons in the hands of irregular forces, and it called for effective and unimpeded delivery of humanitarian assistance and the unimpeded access to detention camps.

In addition, the proposal called upon the participating states to uphold Bosnia and Herzegovina's territorial integrity in keeping with international law and CSCE principles. Other provisions condemned the systematic and widespread use of rape and sexual abuse in the former Yugoslavia and expressed use of rape and sexual abuse in the former Yugoslavia and expressed strong support for the provision of assistance to the victims and the prosecution of those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Indeed, on all but the lifting of the arms embargo there was unanimous support when that measure finally came up for a vote, and as I said earlier, but for, in my opinion, the presence of the American delegation, that resolution would not have been nearly as strong as it was, would not have spoken as forthrightly and directly to the dramatic situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as it ultimately did.

Other provisions were added to the resolution by other members of our delegation of which I will speak.

But, finally, the proposal, the one introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], called for the admission of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia into the CSCE as a full participating state and urged those states which had not already done so to recognize that country. We believe that was an appropriate act. We believe it was a stabilizing act as well.

The United States now has 300 of its own personnel in Macedonia. I had the opportunity to discuss with the President today that we needed to send a very strong and clear message to Mr. Milosevic that any incursion into Macedonia would result in very significant multilateral international response with the full participation of the United States.

The comprehensive United States initiative served as a focal point for much of the discussion of the former Yugoslavia. Divergent opinions were evident, particularly in connection with the suggested lifting of the arms embargo, as I have said, an element which was later dropped despite a passionate and outstanding defense of that provision by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

In particular, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY], I think, moved all of the international representatives as he spoke to the compelling case for humanitarian relief of those in Sarajevo. The Assembly overwhelmingly approved the rest of the U.S. resolution.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] also introduced an important amendment calling upon the Russian Federation to conclude and implement without further delay appropriate bilateral agreements including timetables for the early, orderly, and complete withdrawal of its troops from the territories of the Baltic States. This amendment was unanimously agreed to, and I might say, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] knows and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] knows, the representatives of the Russian Federation were very positive and accommodating and responsive and understood the need to resolve this matter.

I might say that all of us were very pleased to see the positive discussions that occurred between the representatives of Estonia and Latvia and Lithuania and the representatives of the Russian Federation.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], who I thank again for yielding to me and for his outstanding service on the delegation, covered the General Committee on Economic Affairs, Science, Technology, and Environment, where he singlehandedly introduced probably more language into the resolution than any other representative on that committee. He introduced language urging measures reforming countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, reforms that they should take to encourage foreign investment.

He also called for the establishment of a new CSCE mechanism or institution to coordinate and promote environmental policies and protection. He may speak more extensively on those during this hour.

We plan, as a Commission, to follow up on this valuable recommendation with Secretary Christopher and EPA Administrator Browner.

□ 1940

Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York, herself a very strong, outspoken advocate of the rights of others,

not only in this country but around the world, participated actively in the General Committee on Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Questions, which, as BEN CARDIN, my friend, has indicated I was honored to chair. That resolution Ms. SLAUGHTER sponsored, and in which she played the leading role, ensures the adoption of a strong amendment condemning the use of rape as an instrument of war and classifying rape—as clearly it is—specifically as a war crime.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report the U.S. delegation was instrumental in shaping the final Helsinki Declaration of the CSCE assembly.

In addition to the work conducted in Helsinki—and again, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] may discuss this further because he and Ms. SLAUGHTER visited Estonia in July at a critical time, he will speak further of that, and I will revise and extend my remarks on that matter—but it was a very important representation, and in my opinion both Mr. CARDIN and Ms. SLAUGHTER provided meaningful advice at a critical time in deescalating the tensions between the Estonians and the Russian minority that lives in Estonia.

I am pleased to report that a number of their concerns, particularly over the arbitrary nature of some of the provisions of the law on citizenship were later addressed, as discussed by Mr. CARDIN and Ms. SLAUGHTER, by the Parliament the very next day. The delegation assured the Russian-speaking minority that the United States is, indeed, concerned that their rights not be circumscribed.

The Helsinki Declaration of the CSCE Parliamentary Assembly is an impressive document that includes strong language and recommendations regarding a broad range of issues of immediate concern, from refugees to national minorities to an international war crimes tribunal to a forceful declaration on the former Yugoslavia. Our task now is to ensure that these bold statements serve as a blueprint for meaningful action and not simply remain words on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate my colleagues, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MORAN, on the very positive role that they played.

Mr. Speaker, these trips are sometimes criticized. In this case, we left on Monday night, flew all Monday night and got there Tuesday morning, started into meetings at 4 that afternoon and flew back on Friday; not sufficient time to overcome jet lag on either leg.

I believe we had a strong message to deliver both as related to human rights, as to security and economic relations and environmental concerns, so that the purposes of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe result in a more peaceful, more cooperative, economically and environ-

mentally sounder international community would result.

I thank my colleagues for participating in this important meeting.

Mr. CARDIN. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for a very thorough report on our trip.

As he pointed out, we had a small delegation in numbers; we were entitled to have a larger delegation. But I do not think any delegation was more effective than the U.S. delegation in the final products that came out of this meeting. And that was due to the gentleman's outstanding leadership, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and I really want to thank him on behalf of the entire delegation for using the talent that was there and dividing us into different baskets for our work and keeping us on target, setting priorities that were important for the people of our Nation in these meetings. It was really, I think, due to the gentleman's extraordinary knowledge and leadership in the process that we were able, with only five Members, to have such an impact on so many different areas of the final actions that were taken by the parliamentary assembly.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. CARDIN. As the gentleman pointed out, the Helsinki Agreements, the final act that was signed in 1976 in Helsinki, broke the agreements down to three baskets of cooperation among the member states.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has been the most active in our country on the human rights issues and on other issues and has reported, I think, rather thoroughly on that third basket known as the human rights basket. The first basket is the basket on political affairs and security, on which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] served along with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] as two of our representatives on that committee.

The basket dealt with many issues, including the new problems of security among the member states, due to the ethnic differences and religious differences and protection of minorities within the political boundaries of the emerging countries of Europe. As Mr. HOYER has already reported, it dealt with the Baltic Republic and the fact that Russian troops are still within the Baltic Republic.

I must underscore that one point, though, that Congressman HOYER pointed out, and that is that we had the cooperation of the Russian federation in trying to work out specific timetables for removal of the remaining Russian troops from the three Baltic Republics.

But by far the most controversial issue that took most of our time dealt with Bosnia and Hercegovina. And there was no more active person among the 300 parliamentarians—and I know

the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will agree with me—there was no more active participant among the parliamentarians, active parliamentarians, than Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Everyone in the assembly knew of Mr. MCCLOSKEY and his commitment to make sure that the people of Bosnia were heard and that the world attention was caused to be focused on the tragedies that were taking place as we were meeting in Finland.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY]. I know he is on the floor. Perhaps he could help summarize how we proceeded in the meetings as they relate to the matters in which the gentleman was involved.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, a week ago, I was in Helsinki for the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council for Security and Cooperation in Europe, as a member of the U.S. delegation led by my distinguished colleague STENY HOYER. I am proud the U.S. delegation came to that CSCE Assembly prepared to call for concrete action to address the Balkan crisis. I am proud of what we achieved there in terms of CSCE Assembly support for the use of NATO air power in Bosnia, as well as CSCE Assembly support for international recognition of Macedonia and its full membership in the CSCE.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] for calling this special order and also for his leadership in these issues and participation and companionship at the conference. And to Mr. HOYER, our speaker, I know the gentleman, Mr. CARDIN, would share my gratitude.

I would like to extend my exceeding thanks for the opportunity to be on the commission and also to make this trip.

I think, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has mentioned, I think it obvious that despite the small number of our delegation, the five of us, that we did make a definite impact, particularly as to the problems in the Balkans and also, as Mr. HOYER said, the gentleman from Maryland's [Mr. CARDIN] efforts in the economic and Estonian areas. I am proud to realize that, in essence, for all the discussion that was scheduled as to the former Yugoslavia and the Balkans, there would have been no suggestions as to an action plan or how to proceed or what to do from this point in time, I think, without the participation of the American delegation, and particularly in that regard I want to say that, as we all know, Mr. HOYER has been one of the leaders in the Congress on this issue. I think he has been a leader in the Congress and, quite frankly, a leader internationally for months and more than months, he has been speaking up for justice to be backed by forthright action, particularly in the form of the Hoyer-DeConcini resolution, which in

some substance was, as we know, recently passed out by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in all candor, I might add, with some strong leadership and innovative efforts by the gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE.

I regret deeply that largely due to the resistance of the French and British delegations, the United States delegation was not able to get the full CSCE Assembly on board the lifting of the U.N. arms embargo from Bosnia. Twice during this century the United States has assured the self-defense and indeed the defense of France and Britain. The current governments of these two European powers should be deeply ashamed of their refusal to let Bosnia act in its own self-defense.

I asked the parliamentary delegations in Helsinki to think about Sarajevo for a minute—remembering that conditions in the rest of Bosnia are generally much worse than in this brave city.

Sarajevo has been under brutal siege for over 450 days. For these 450 days its people—380,000 men, women, and children, Bosnian Moslems, Croats and Serbs alike—have been subjected to shelling and sniper fire from the surrounding mountain tops.

Tens of thousands of noncombatant men, women, and children have been intentionally killed and maimed—randomly, suddenly, senselessly.

All of these people—people just like us—have been subject to constant fear of death for themselves and for loved ones, to gradual starvation, to darkness and cold, to the most primitive living conditions, to the absence of medical care, to the destruction of their property, and the loss of their livelihoods.

All of these people have been subject to the terrifying reality of being trapped, with no means to drive off their tormentors, and no means to escape.

Remember the proud boast of the Bosnian-Serb war criminal Karadzic, who crowed that he had the people of Sarajevo "trapped like mice in a pumpkin," and boasts to the Western press that his artillery can "blow Sarajevo to bits." Remember the savage words of his military chief Mladic, egging on his artillery men to "hit, hit, burn, burn" Sarajevo.

All of these people of Sarajevo have been subject, as well, to the black despair of hopelessness, and the bitter realization that they have been abandoned by the Western world to which they belong and on which they counted so idealistically.

Western governments have stood by and let this happen. Worse than that, they have intervened on the side of the perpetrators of this cruel and senseless siege, on the side of genocide. They have denied the Bosnian Government the right and the means to self-defense, by maintaining on Bosnia the U.N.

arms embargo applied to the former Yugoslavia.

Western governments have sought to shroud their complicity in the murder of Sarajevo, the murder of Bosnia and 200,000 of its people, with the most sanctimonious hypocrisy that one could possibly imagine.

Think a minute of all the European leaders, like the Prime Minister of Britain, who have had the gall to reject lifting the U.N. arms embargo from the Bosnian Government because this would be "the policy of despair."

Whose despair? The despair of Western politicians at having to admit their responsibility for policies which have abetted genocide in Bosnia?

What about the despair of the people of besieged Sarajevo? What about the despair of the 200,000 Bosnian victims of systematic murder? What about the despair of the tens of thousands of Bosnian victims of systematic rape? What about the despair of the hundreds of thousands of Bosnians who have been forcibly driven from their homes, separated from their loved ones, and denied a future as a people?

It seems now the European governments and Washington want to wash their hands of Bosnia completely—with Owen and Stoltenberg doing their dirty work for them.

The U.N. Security Council, the G-7 Summit, the CSCE and NATO all continue to mouth lip service to the U.N. Charter, the Helsinki Final Act, the London Conference on former Yugoslavia, and the myriad U.N. Security Council Resolution on Bosnia.

Meanwhile, Owen and Stoltenberg implement the real policies of Western governments. This real policy is clearly to attempt to impose surrender on the Bosnian Government. Owen and Stoltenberg therefore endorse the partition schemes of Milosevic and Tudjman, Karadzic and Boban.

Owen becomes the virtual alter ego of Karadzic and Mladic. Karadzic threatens the Bosnian Government with total war if it does not come to the surrender table. Owen insists that they really must—even if the negotiating table has only served as a cover for Bosnia's gradual extermination for the past 16 months.

And now, and mark this well, Owen and Stoltenberg join Karadzic in threatening the Bosnian Government. Owen and Stoltenberg have adopted the position that if the Bosnian Government does not agree now to negotiate on the basis of the Serb-Croat partition plan, they may seek a full U.N. withdrawal from Bosnia—the end of the modicum of protection provided by the peacekeepers, and the end to the modicum of humanitarian relief provided by UNHCR.

Who mandated Owen and Stoltenberg—or before them, Vance and Owen, or before them Carrington and Cuttillheiro—to negotiate the ethnic

partition of Bosnia? Are not the current efforts of Owen and Stoltenberg flagrant violations of the Helsinki Final Act, the U.N. Charter, and the U.N. Security Council's resolutions on Bosnia since May 1992? And who ever instructed Owen and Stoltenberg to use strong-arm pressure tactics on the Bosnian Government? Why are Western governments even tolerating the behavior of these two men?

Meanwhile, Western governments stand by, silent and passive—very much as if all they want is for the Bosnians to curl up and die, and thus end their embarrassment.

Never in my political life have I seen such an obscene gap between high-road words and low-road deeds. Never have I seen so much obfuscation and equivocation, so much moral and political cowardice, or so much energy expended in the hope of evading responsibility.

Never could I have imagined the governments of the transatlantic community so deeply embroiled in pious rationalization, face-saving posturing, and wishful self-delusion.

How can we tolerate a situation where genocide is raging in southeastern Europe? How can we tolerate a situation where our governments, and we, continue to mouth pious rhetoric—while Owen and Stoltenberg, as agents of the United Nations, European Community, and Council for Security and Cooperation in Europe, are working hand in hand with the perpetrators of this genocide?

And how can we imagine even for a minute that this travesty will somehow lead to peace in the Balkans? Are Western governments so delusionary as to believe that a greater Serbia created by genocidal aggression will lead to a stable Balkans?

Do Western governments imagine that Milosevic and his thugs will desist from genocide in Kosovo, the Sandzak, Vojvodina, and independent Macedonia—after being rewarded for it in Bosnia?

There is only one path out of the Balkan crisis. Western governments must shake off their defeatism.

They must lift their strategies to the level of their core values and principles, instead of letting their core values and principles be corrupted by compromise with evil.

They must finally take sides with the Bosnian Government, help it arm itself instead of hobbling it with an arms embargo, and use NATO air power to enforce the Security Council's resolutions.

They must realize and act on the reality that Milosevic will continue to traumatize the Balkans, to destabilize Europe, and to threaten international peace and security until he is defeated militarily and contained.

For Sarajevo and its 380,000 men, women, and children, this Western action must come now. This capital of a

sovereign, independent CSCE and U.N. member state has become one vast concentration camp. Its people are on the verge of mental and physical collapse that could come within days. While we debate our resolutions and rhetorical statements, they face their darkest hour.

I pray that we will see Western action, within days, that will earn the respect to Sarajevo's embattled people.

Press reports indicate President Clinton has asked his National Security staff to review options to lift the siege of Sarajevo. I believe the President understands the moral and strategic stakes in Bosnia, and the human and historic imperative of lifting the siege of Sarajevo. I hope his National Security staff can rise to the occasion to help him meet this imperative.

I believe President Clinton's leadership can generate strong and energetic support for the use of all necessary means, including U.S. military force, to break the siege of Sarajevo.

This action will liberate Sarajevo from the nightmare it has suffered for the past 16 months. It will liberate America and Europe from what otherwise will be a historical disgrace. It will let Bill Clinton walk the path of Harry Truman—and have the same kind of historical impact on the post-cold-war world as Harry Truman had on the postwar era.

□ 2000

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate again the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] not only for his report here, but for his commitment to the people of that region who have been devastated by what has been occurring.

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] for yielding, and I want to congratulate, as he has, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] not only on his statement, but for his work in Helsinki and in so many different fora, both in Europe and here in this country, on behalf of a besieged people.

As my colleagues know, we, it seems, refer to this in sort of an intellectual framework, and it does not have a human face. Earlier today our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a Republican and the cochairman of the fire service caucus, which I have the privilege of chairing this year, spoke, and he spoke about a gentleman named Kenan Slinic, S-l-i-n-i-c. Kenan Slinic is a young man, and he made a statement. He is the chief of the fire service in Sarajevo, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] inserted his statement as he made a statement on the floor today, a handwritten statement that he made at the fire service caucus a few months ago.

He said:

In 1992 my country, Bosnia-Herzegovina, became the youngest member in the United Nations family of nations. On April 5, 1992, war came to my country, my city and my people. Sarajevo and other cities of Bosnia-Herzegovina were put under siege.

He went on to talk about his experience, the loss of 10 firefighters, unarmed, carrying out a service to their community to try to put out fires started by the shelling from Serbian artillery in the hills surrounding Sarajevo and 28 of his colleagues who were wounded in 2 such shellings.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, this young man, who has a 6-year-old daughter and a young wife, was shot twice in the back of his head. He was killed, a young firefighter, unarmed, trying to put out fires, trying to protect his community.

Now there is no embargo on fire equipment, and, as a matter of fact, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be accompanying a delegation to take some fire equipment to Sarajevo in August.

There is a young firefighter from this country whose name is John Jordon who is over there working with the fire department. Unfortunately, although there is no embargo on fire equipment to save property and persons from fire, there is an embargo on saving besieged people and giving them the right to self-defense.

No one has raised that issue more pointedly, more dramatically, more cogently, than our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

I say to my colleagues, "Tears come to your eyes when you read the third page of the statement made by Mr. Slinic." He concluded his speech or brief talk to 2,000 assembled firefighters from across Canada, the United States, and other nations. He said this:

I hope that I'll be able to attend the next national fire and emergency services dinner under much better circumstances for my country.

That young man, of course, will not be able to do that. He will not be able to do it because, in violations of the norms of international behavior, in violations of international law, in violations of all international documents related to human rights, Bosnia and Herzegovina has been put under siege by an invader.

What we raised at the parliamentary assembly was the question as to whether or not we can have a new world order if the world stands silently and if the world stands without action to assist those invaded, those who find themselves and their democracy undermined in the worst violations of human rights that we have seen in this decade.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this special order and was pleased to join with this delegation in raising for the international commu-

nity, on behalf of our country, these compelling issues, not just for this young fireman, but for the people, and not just in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We are going to have hearings next week in the Helsinki Commission about the spillover effect.

Mr. Speaker, this was the cradle of World War I. This is where it started because the world watched, and waited, and took no action. We should learn the lessons of history and let those who would destabilize the international community by force know that it will not be tolerated, not just by the superpower, the United States, but by the nations united in league against the violations of international law.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] for having yielded further.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] bringing to our attention the brave firefighter who literally gave his life for his country. He pointed out very clearly that, although the cold war is over, problems, very deep problems, still exist in Europe that very much affect each of us here in this country.

I would like to, if I might, talk about a success story. We talk about the problems that we are having, and there are many problems, but a potential problem may have been avoided in Estonia.

Estonia has a very explosive situation where the Russian-speaking minority represent over one-third of the population of this new country, a country that is just establishing its democratic principles and institutions of government, that is trying to deal with tremendous change and their market economy, where they have gone to a market economy, where they have changed rather quickly, where they have developed their own currency, were the first Balkans to develop their own currency and be disciplined by economic reform which brought about some significant changes in the economic circumstances of the people that live in Estonia.

But Estonia, as my colleague knows, most of the Russian-speaking people who now live in Estonia were brought to Estonia against their will. Estonia was annexed to the former Soviet Union against its will, an act that this Nation never recognized, and it is understandable that the people of Estonia resent the fact that a population was brought into their country against their will in an effort mainly for military purposes, and now that Estonia has gained its independence, there are many people who are family members of the population that is now residing in Estonia that is Russian-speaking, and they now need to deal with the rights of protecting all the people in their country, including the Russian-speaking people who now wish to live and become citizens of Estonia.

So, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] mentioned that we visited Estonia, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] and I have visited Estonia, on July 8. It was a very historic moment because the President had just called back the Parliament into an extraordinary session. When we arrived there we were not sure whether, in fact, there would be a quorum present for this Parliament because it was an extremely controversial meeting. The Estonia Parliament had passed a law for aliens that raised very serious questions whether the Russian-speaking people that reside in Estonia would be given the full protection of citizenship and be able to become citizens of Estonia, and it was a very controversial act. It was understandable, the reaction by the people of Estonia, but it was the law that was passed that raised very serious problems for the international community. CSCE sent a communication to the President of Estonia.

□ 2010

Many of the Council of Europe sent communications to Estonia and asked the President to please reconsider that act, even though the local political environment, the only people that can vote in Estonia are Estonians. The Russian-speaking population, over one-third, are not permitted to vote. So the constituency did not want to see a change in that law of aliens. They thought it was appropriate, considering the historical aspects of why the Russian-speaking population had come to Estonia.

But it was wrong, the law. And we spoke out against it and we sent communications to the people. We had a chance when we arrived in Estonia to meet with the Prime Minister, Mr. Laar, a very young person, and the Foreign Minister, Mr. Velliste, as well as the minister who is in charge of negotiations between Russia and Estonia, Mr. Lujak. We had a chance to also meet with the representatives from the various Russian-speaking groups, including the community of Narva, which is up in the northeast and is a majority, overwhelming majority, of Russian-speaking people, that border the Russian Federation, to talk about the problems, to open up dialogue, to try to get changes made in the law of aliens that we thought were improper, that put too much subjectivity as to whether the Russian-speaking people who had lived in Estonia for many years and considered themselves to be Estonians, would get the full protection of citizenship in that country, including the right to vote and participate fully in the economic activities of their society. And we were not sure when we arrived in Estonia whether that would become a reality.

We were very pleased by the attitude of the public officials, their willingness

to accept the recommendations of the international community, and their willingness to set up a dialogue with the representatives from the Russian-speaking population.

The representatives from the Russian-speaking population and the representatives from the Estonian Government were together in making sure that this issue was resolved peacefully, through negotiations, and fairly. And when people are committed to talking out their problems, we do not have the bloodshed that took place and is taking place in the former Yugoslavia. I hope we were able to avoid that in the Baltic Republic of Estonia, and I am very optimistic that we can. Because the day that we were there we got some commitments from the Prime Minister of Estonia as to changes that they anticipated would be made.

The following day, July 9, actually the Parliament acted late July 8, the day we were there, and the following day we received the results of the action taken by the Estonian Parliament to modify the law affecting the Russian-speaking people who are in Estonia.

I must tell you I was very disappointed when I saw the international press account of it that evening, because the international press account tried to provoke some controversy between the Russian-speaking people and the Estonians, when in reality the changes made by the Estonia parliament were those suggestions that were made by CSCE and the Council of Europe. And we received a communique from the European Community in support and thankful of what the Government of Estonia did to change their laws, to protect the Russian-speaking people that live in Estonia today.

We also received a communique not only from the Estonian Government, but from the representatives from the Russian-speaking population in Estonia, speaking to the fact that a roundtable discussion has taken place and will continue to take place; that a mechanism has been set up for the Russian-speaking representatives to meet on a regular basis with the Estonian officials so they can resolve not just the citizenship laws affecting the people of Estonia, but also local governance issues, economic issues, passports, all the other aspects. Some of the people in Estonia may very well want to become Russian citizens, or may want to become citizens of other countries, but need protection while they are in Estonia. And these dialogues we are very optimistic will work out the status of what is taking place in that country.

So we were extremely optimistic that the CSCE process is working; that we were able here to hopefully avoid problems that have taken place in too many of the new republics of Europe.

I think it really speaks to the fact that our presence, the presence of the

United States in these meetings, has had very, very positive results. The people of the Baltic Republics reminded us of how important it was for the United States to stand by them when their voices were not being heard by any other people.

They specifically wanted me to bring back and mention to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] their very deep appreciation for the delegation that the gentleman led there 2 years ago during the darkest moments in the Baltic Republics, when people were being slaughtered on the streets and it was the U.S. delegation that arrived that gave the people of the Baltic Republics hope to stand by their convictions.

Estonia has avoided violence. It avoided violence during that period of time.

So I really want to speak of how pleased the gentlewoman from New York [Mr. SLAUGHTER] and I were to participate in those meetings in Florida and how pleased we were that the process appears to be working.

Now, I want to make it clear, it is far from resolved. Whenever you have such a large number of people, and some are extremely radical, on both sides, the chances of serious problems erupting is there. But we are convinced that by our presence and our continued interest in working with the government and the representatives of the Russian-speaking population, that we can make a very constructive part of resolving their problems. So we were very pleased to participate in that meeting on behalf of our delegation.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, the CSCE, which was signed in 1975 by President Ford, as the gentleman knows was controversial. It was controversial because it was perceived perhaps as the Soviet Union winning a recognition of the de facto borders that then existed in Europe.

It created not a bureaucracy, not a structure of people, but it created a mechanism for communication, and created international meetings on a regular basis.

What we found during the course of those meetings was that as people discussed the principles that have now become essentially the principles of the international community, principles of which, frankly, the United States is one of the principal proponents and examples of in the world, it was found that the discussion of these principles and ideas, particularly as they were applied to specific cases of individuals whose human rights or individual rights had been violated, or groups of people whose rights had been violated, ultimately could not stand up to the light of day and the light of discussion.

Your visit, along with the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] to Estonia, and your representation that the international community

cares about this situation, that the international community is prepared to honestly participate in trying to solve this, went a significant way toward deescalating, as the gentleman points out, a very tense situation, that could and might still erupt in a violent confrontation.

It is this process that has been created that will ultimately lead to a new world order of resolving differences through discussion, debate, compromise, and agreement, that will ultimately make for a safer, more secure world. And as we in this country grapple today and this week and next week and the week thereafter in strengthening our own economy, to create jobs and opportunity for this generation and generations to come in this country, the opportunities for our young people in the future will be greatly enhanced if we have success in creating an international community that resolves its differences, not through violence, but through cooperation, discussion, and agreement.

Mr. CARDIN. I think the gentleman has stated that very, very well. It certainly is in the interest of this country for our participation. I really appreciate the Speaker's appointment to the Commission. I have now been a member of the Commission I guess for now 2 weeks, and I am really looking forward to working with you on these issues.

It is clear, and I think the American people understand the security issues involved in our meetings in CSCE, and on human rights we have taken the leadership role internationally on human rights, and I think the people of this Nation are proud of the role we have played. And the Helsinki Commission is known for its statements on human rights.

□ 2020

Also, now the economic issues, the environmental issues are going to become more and more important. You mentioned that we pushed tough environmental standards internationally. We are all suffering from what happened at Chernobyl. We do not want to see another Chernobyl. We know, for example, that the nuclear power facilities do not have the safety standards in the former Republics of the Soviet Union that they should.

We spoke out about that. It is in the interest of the people of this Nation. It is in the interest of all of the citizens of the participating states of CSCE to be concerned about these issues.

Sometimes I know it is difficult for our constituents to understand our participation in these international groups, but it is clear to me that the Helsinki Commission has had a history of very effectively representing the rights of this country and the interests of this country in these meetings.

I very much look forward to working with you to hopefully resolve problems

so they do not make the front pages of the paper. That is our objective, to avoid the types of tragedies that we have seen too frequently in this world.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BEVILL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of wife's illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 60 minutes today, and on July 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and August 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and September 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and October 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and November 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, and December 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

Mr. DREIER, for 60 minutes, on October 5.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 60 minutes each day, on July 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. LOWEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SABO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARDIN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes each day, on July 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and August 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes each day, on August 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and September 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and October 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and November 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, and December 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

Mr. POSHARD, for 60 minutes each day, on July 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UNDERWOOD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOYER, for 60 minutes, on July 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. BLUTE.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. EWING.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. CAMP.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. LOWEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSE.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER in two instances.

Mr. BROWDER.

Mr. RAHALL.

Ms. SCHENK.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. BROWN of California in three instances.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. SISISKY.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. COPPERSMITH.

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. KREIDLER.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. BRYANT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UNDERWOOD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. LONG.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. ROEMER.

Mr. HUGHES.

Mrs. LLOYD.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 409. An act to extend the terms of various patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 616. An act to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1130. An act to provide for continuing authorization of Federal employee leave transfer and leave bank programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1189. An act to entitle certain armored car crew members to lawfully carry a weapon in any State while protecting the security of valuable goods in interstate commerce in the service of an armored car company.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 19, 1993, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1597. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to South Africa, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1598. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Jeffrey Davidow, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Venezuela; Donald C. Johnson, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Mongolia; James J. Blanchard, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to Canada; Walter C. Carrington, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nigeria; and Thomas J. Dodd, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1305. A bill to make boundary adjustments and other miscellaneous changes to authorities and programs of the National Park Service; with amendments (Rept. 103-178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2239. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1758. A bill to revise, codify, and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to transpor-

tation, as subtitles II, and V-X of title 49, United States Code, "Transportation", and to make other technical improvements in the Code; with an amendment (Rept. 103-180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SWETT:

H.R. 2642. A bill to provide for financing of certain recreational facilities in the White Mountain National Forest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 2643. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a biennial report on nutrition and health by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 2644. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 2645. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain surplus real property located at Fort Ord, CA; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 2646. A bill to direct that certain Federal financial benefits be provided only to citizens and nationals of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Agriculture.

By Mr. KREIDLER:

H.R. 2647. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the effective date of any changes in benefits under the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance program shall be based on the International Date Line; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. DICKS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2648. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure the availability of Federal health insurance, life insurance, and retirement benefits with respect to certain Federal employees serving under temporary appointments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINGE (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 2649. A bill to authorize States and political subdivisions of States to control the movement of municipal solid waste generated within their jurisdictions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 2650. A bill to designate portions of the Maurice River and its tributaries in the State of New Jersey as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 2651. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for confined spoil disposal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROEMER:

H.R. 2652. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the estab-

lishment through the National Institutes of Health of a data system and an information clearinghouse with respect to rare diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

H.R. 2653. A bill to amend section 6(d) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to increase the amount of payments made by public housing agencies in lieu of paying State, city, county, and local taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SARPALIUS (for himself, Mr.

ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HAYES, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 2654. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to exempt certain small landfills from the groundwater monitoring requirements contained in landfill regulations promulgated by the Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SHEPHERD (for herself, Mrs.

SCHROEDER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H.R. 2655. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from carrying out the launch of a missile as part of a test program in any case in which an unavoidable or anticipated result of the launch would be the release of debris in a land area of the United States outside a designated Department of Defense test range; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 2656. A bill to encourage States to ensure the quality of private security services, and the competence of private security officer personnel, by authorizing funds for that purpose; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 2657. A bill to direct the Coast Guard to establish the Gulf of Mexico Regional Fisheries Law Enforcement Training Center; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself and Mr.

LANCASTER):

H.R. 2658. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to evaluate the technological feasibility and environmental benefits of having tank vessels carry oil spill prevention and response technology; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr.

HALL of Texas, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut):

H.R. 2659. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to the transplantation of organs and of bone marrow; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 2660. A bill to amend the act known as the "Miller Act" to raise the value of contracts for which performance bonds and payment bonds are required under that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAMS (for himself, Mr. BEUTER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 2661. A bill to enhance the availability of credit in disaster areas by reducing the regulatory burden imposed upon insured depository institutions to the extent such action is consistent with the safety and soundness of the institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MFUME, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2662. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the small business and capital ownership development program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SANGMEISTER (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 2663. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the ability of the United States to attract and retain qualified air traffic controllers by offering controllers premium pay for Saturday work, and by raising the controller differential from 5 to 15 percent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VOLKMER (for himself and Mr. GUNDERSON):

H.R. 2664. A bill to achieve needed savings in net Federal expenditures under the milk price support program through establishment of a milk producer self-help program to dispose of surplus dairy products, expand exports, and stabilize the market for milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. DELUMS):

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution concerning the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution encouraging United States businesses to adopt a voluntary code for applying internationally recognized human rights principles when engaging in commerce in the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 6, 1994, as "National Elevator and Escalator Safety Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to designate the 10-year period beginning January 1, 1994,

as the National Decade of Historic Preservation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H.J. Res. 233. Joint resolution designating the oak as the national arboreal emblem of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

224. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to saving the rain forests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

225. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the spotted owl; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas introduced a bill (H.R. 2665) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries for the vessel *Compass Rose*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 133: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 299: Mr. WYDEN and Mr. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 417: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. QUILLIN.

H.R. 466: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 509: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 544: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.
H.R. 642: Mr. BAKER of California.
H.R. 688: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. TUCKER.

H.R. 702: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 749: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 769: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 794: Mr. SKEEN and Mrs. MEEK.
H.R. 814: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 830: Mr. BLUTE and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 833: Ms. SNOWE and Mr. MACHTLEY.
H.R. 883: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 886: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. ORTON, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 911: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 915: Mr. WYNN, Mr. FOGLETTA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 963: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1006: Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 1095: Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 1141: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TANNER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1149: Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 1151: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1195: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1200: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 1237: Mr. WYNN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1245: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1312: Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 1403: Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1434: Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1475: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 1480: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1505: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1521: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1551: Mr. ORTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1604: Mr. QUINN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 1605: Mr. KING.

H.R. 1608: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GEJDERSON, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1707: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1821: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1887: Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1921: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1980: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1981: Mr. QUINN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KYL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 2094: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2121: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. FURSE, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. HORN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2292: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2305: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 2310: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2346: Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2365: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2370: Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. APPELEGATE.

H.R. 2488: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 2572: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2607: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 2626: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. MALONEY.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 118: Mr. CARR and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. TANNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.J. Res. 165: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.J. Res. 198: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.J. Res. 202: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. OWENS.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SABO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 205: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. STARK, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FISH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. MEEK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SHAW, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. COX, Mr. EWING, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. HUTTO.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. WASHINGTON.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mrs. MINK.

H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. KLINK, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H. Res. 175: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2010

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

Page 265, line 2, strike the close quotation marks and the semicolon.

Page 265, after line 2, insert the following:

"(18) Programs that provide health, education, and welfare services that augment the activities of State and local agencies, to be carried out in a fiscal year for which the aggregate amount of funds available to such agencies is not less than the annual average aggregate amount of funds available to such agencies for the period of 3 fiscal years preceding such fiscal year;"

By Mr. HALL of Ohio:

Page 18, line 20, strike "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(14) A program that seeks to eliminate hunger in communities and rural areas through service in projects—

"(A) involving food banks, food pantries, and nonprofit organizations that provide food during emergencies;

"(B) involving the gleaning of prepared and unprepared food that would otherwise be discharged as unusable so that the usable portion of such food may be donated to food banks, food pantries, and other nonprofit organizations;

"(C) seeking to address the long-term causes of hunger through education and the delivery of appropriate services; or

"(D) providing training in basic health, nutrition, and life skills necessary to alleviate hunger in communities and rural areas.

"(15)"

By Mr. SOLOMON:

Page 247, after line 3, strike the close quotation marks and the final period.

Page 247, after line 3, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) SPECIFICATION OF BUDGET FUNCTION.—The authorizations of appropriations contained in this section shall be considered to be a component of budget function 500 as used by the Office of Management and Budget to cover education, training, employment, and social services, and, as such, shall be considered as related to the programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for budgetary purposes."

Page 284, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

"(5) SPECIFICATION OF BUDGET FUNCTION.—The authorizations of appropriations contained in this subsection shall be considered to be a component of budget function 500 as used by the Office of Management and Budget to cover education, training, employment and social services, and, as such, shall be considered as related to the programs of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for budgetary purposes."

By Mr. STUMP:

Page 79, strike line 18 through 23 and insert the following:

"(a) AMOUNTS GENERALLY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), an individual described in section 146(a) who successfully completes a required term of services in an approved national service position shall receive a national service educational award having a value, for each of not more than 2 of such terms of service, equal to—

"(1) 12 times the monthly rate used for the calculation of basic educational assistance allowances under section 3015(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, as in effect on the date of the completion of such term of service; multiplied by

"(2) 80 percent."